

THE
CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—NOVEMBER, 1871.—No. 62.

ARTICLE I.

THE VALUE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY TO THE
PREACHER.*

The aim of Theological Seminaries is, not to send into the world learned theologians, but able and successful preachers. Revealed truth is intended for the people at large, and accomplishes its purpose by its effect upon *them*; by elevating them in morals, imbuing them with religious sentiments, and placing them in a state of reconciliation with God. In this fact is to be found the test to which our theological seminaries must be brought. What effect do they have on the people? is the question of importance. What do the graduates of the seminaries accomplish when they address public congregations? Can they speak more powerfully, more successfully because of the theological training which they have received?

It is very clear if these questions are to receive a favorable answer, students in theology are not to be instructed *simply* in the system of Christian doctrines. The exposition and defense of *creeds* is ordinarily not the best method, much less

* An address by Rev. Geo. N. Boardman, D. D., at his inauguration as Professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Theological Seminary, Sept. 14, 1871.

the only method of preaching. The people at large become wearied after a time with mere intellectual statements. Men fail to carry along the nice distinctions that separate truth from error; women fail to see what practical results are to flow from the demonstration of truths which they never doubted; children are unable to connect the arguments which sustain perseverance and effectual calling with what they have read in the New Testament. The Holy Spirit manifests no *special* affinity for preaching which has this as its chief merit, that it sets the science of theology among the sciences which the learned cultivate. Merely doctrinal preaching leaves the heart uncultivated. Though it may strongly inculcate the love which is a *preference* of God to the world, it fails to kindle that love which pants after God as the heart panteth for the water-brooks. It is the religion of song and tears, of confessions and promises that wakens aspirations and unlooses the grasp of worldliness. When Christian teachers spend their time in drawing lines and driving stakes, their pupils become spectators rather than an audience, and assent to what they see rather than become obedient *hearers* of the word. They become men of orthodoxy rather than men of faith. Communities that have fallen under the influence of such churches, have become irreligious, not through error, but because of the paucity of the truths they have believed, and the want of moving power in the doctrines they have been taught. From their irreligion they have fallen into error more general, if not more fatal, than any which could have entered a parish in which the *Holy Spirit* was giving constant demonstration of the truth.

A preacher who makes his appearance amid such churches and such ministers with the Bible in his hand seems like one who has opened a fountain in a desert. When he comes to speak with authority, *i. e.*, from personal knowledge of truths that are powers, and of experiences which show that God is with men, when he speaks of conversation and sanctification as

facts, the people hear and say, as they turn from their theological *dogmas*, "give us of this water that we thirst not."

On the other hand, an absolute *eg lect* to preach the doctrines of theology is a most sad and ruinous failure in the discharge of duty on the part of the preacher. There is a time to set forth creeds, to say "I believe," and give a reason for one's faith. There are always some in a congregation who must be addressed through the intellect. Preaching will not be respected which does not sometimes *prove* the truth, and show how things *ought* to be. The times are not always the same. You can not preach to those who are indignant over political wrongs as you would to those suffering from a dispensation of God in His control of the natural world. You can not preach in summer as you would in winter. A minister must not talk to the children always. There are texts in the Bible which warn him, who speaks for God, that he must set the divine works in revelation and redemption, by the side of the divine works in creation. The Spirit of God works in manifold ways, and the preacher must follow that divine Guide. He must attempt so to preach as to profit all his congregation—that one to whom is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, and *him* to whom faith is given by the same Spirit, the disciple to whom it is given to discern spirits, and him to whom is accorded the power of interpretation.

Moreover, there is very little preaching, to whomever addressed, which does not rest directly on scientific doctrines. Almost every sentence of the Sermon on the Mount starts from a principle. You see and feel that it is firmly established in every precept. Each of the beatitudes ends with a reason, nearly one-half of every one follows the "for." "Blessed are the poor in spirit, *for* theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "Ye are the salt of the earth;" "Ye are the light of the world;" "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time," are all sentences which waken inquiry not to be answered in a moment. If we may judge of Christ's preaching by this

sermon, though He was not given to formal statements in His public addresses, it would be very easy to draw a *creed* from His utterances. One could begin with, "I believe in God, the Father, Almighty," and, without doing violence to the discourse, come far down into the Westminster Catechism.

There are occasions when gentle and soothing words only are in place; there are times when the children should be taken with guile and taught truth before they are aware of it; you may tell them a story which is more than a story in the recollection. But such preaching is only exceptional. It becomes mawkish as soon as we have a *little* too much of it. Preaching, to be respectable even, must ordinarily have a clear and obvious relation to important truth. Though sermons need not often attempt to prove that revelation is well ordered, that Christian doctrines stand of themselves, still they should *always imply* that the gospel is everlasting truth, that its precepts have a reality and a relation to human society, that they are *seed, good seed*, and that in good soil they will bring forth *fruit*.

It is a question for the preacher, and for the theological seminaries, therefore, how the evils of doctrinal preaching shall be avoided, and its advantages secured. In questions of this kind it is often said, there is a golden mean, and the problem is solved or put aside by splitting the difference. But this is an indolent way of settling any question, and in the present case can be of no practical value. There is such a difference in congregations, that some need all the doctrinal preaching they will bear every Sabbath day; while others are already sufficiently instructed to be profited by hortatory or narrative discourses.

The only direction which can be given which will meet every demand in the case is this: the *preacher* should *himself* be thoroughly imbued with Christian doctrine. He should go quite beyond that stage of culture which implies that he has read one or two of the best treatises on each of the doctrines,

and implies that he is able to state the current and orthodox opinion; he should be imbued with Christian doctrine, think it and be guided to other thought by it; he should be so well acquainted with the doctrines as to be able to find his way from one to the other without the aid of beaten tracks, for he should be familiar with the connection of doctrines. He should be able to see all the doctrines as a unit, and know them, not as separate skeletons, but as harmonized and combined, growing compactly together, as all the members of the Church in the Lord grow into a holy temple. Preachers who have thus a mastery of the science of theology can use the doctrines for the good of their hearers, and under the guidance of their own instincts, will bring them forward at the proper time, in the right proportions. Such preachers will not repel an audience, by showing the bare timbers of a sermon—a thing too often identical with doctrinal preaching. It is the man who is aware of his own defect, who is conscious that he ought to teach more doctrine, and resolves to try, who brings ill-jointed lumber into the house of God, and sets up his scaffolding in the sight of the audience. But here, as in every other department of labor, the man who is *master* of his work works easily—no one knows that he *works* at all. Hearers may listen to such a one and go home and not know, till they think over the day's instruction, that *that* sermon meant election, and that another showed that Christ must be God. I do not say all doctrinal preaching should be in such forms, but a pastor should be *able* to present it in such ways, and then much more can he present it, when occasion requires, with doctrinal statements, with arguments and refutations. I invite attention, then, to some considerations which show that thorough acquaintance with systematic theology is of essential advantage to the preacher.

1. A knowledge of systematic theology is an essential aid to the preacher in *understanding the Bible*. There are certain periods in the history of the Church where the phrases, "the

Bible the only creed," "the Bible a sufficient creed," become popular. The cry is generally started by well-meaning persons who have been repelled by harsh and dry discussions in theology. It is, however, for the most part, the watchword of weak men, and never can become an accepted proverb of intelligent Christians. There is danger, however, that at times it may here and there give a wrong tendency to the views and feelings of Christian communities. The sentiment on which the assertion is founded is a mistaken one, and its unsoundness ought sometimes to be exposed.

The Bible makes great demands on the good sense and sound judgment of its readers. It is peculiarly characterized by gaps, and seems specially indifferent to the praise of consistency. It does, indeed, as a whole, when thoroughly understood, and when the principles implied in it are supplied, justify itself, and appear capable of defending itself, but it expects that those who attempt to interpret it will bring with them entire candor, and the ready admission of those laws on which belief is founded.

The Bible was written by different men, who wrote the truth as they saw it, without supposing themselves called upon to bring their statements into harmony with the views of those who should write after them, or of those who had written before them. One said, "God is a rock;" another, "He is Spirit." One said, "God is love;" another said, "He is a terrible God." One said, "He is a jealous God;" another said, "He is slow to anger." In one place it is written that the pure in heart shall see God; in another place it is said, He is a Being whom no man hath seen or can see; in one place it is said, if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, so that the sin can be passed over; in another place it is said, if one fall away it is impossible to renew him unto repentance; sometimes it is said that God hardens the sinner's heart; at other times it is said that he hardens his own heart; by the mouth of one of His servants God says, "turn ye, turn ye, for why

will ye die," but Christ says, "no man can come to Me except the Father, which hath sent Me, draw him;" we are told that every man is to be judged according to his deeds, and we are told again that our salvation is not for works of righteousness which we have done, but according to the grace of God in Christ. Now these diverse assertions are not contradictions; —but why not? Because every person is expected to compare them one with another, and elicit the meaning of the different assertions when reconciled. Let any one write down this meaning in the cold language of the intellect, and he has already begun his creed. And the time will come, as he proceeds with his study of the Word of God, when he will need the aid of all his philosophy and of all the wisdom embodied in his digest of doctrine, in order to interpret some of the passages of the Holy Word. Any one who takes the Bible for his guide must still look well to his own opinions to make sure that he does not consider God the author of sin, or else consider man independent of God's control. The reader of the Bible will have some trouble in deciding what its creed is on the questions of election and reprobation. Which is the doctrine of the Bible: that God would not have any perish, or that Pharaoh was raised up to show by his *perdition* that God is a ruler severe and just?

There is a still more fundamental reason why settled opinions in systematic theology are a necessity for a thorough understanding of the Bible. Revelation presupposes natural theology. The Bible, therefore, which is a narrative of the revelations which God has made, does not *teach* the most *elementary* doctrines of religion. It is assumed that men are in *possession* of these, and that they need a revelation to carry on and complete a scheme of doctrines, perhaps I should say beliefs, which is already begun.

The Bible does not formally teach the existence of God. It implies that existence; but let it be denied, and then what is the Bible worth? or let one attempt to prove, from the Bible

the existence of God, and on what is his argument founded? The Bible as a fact in nature may be of service in proving the divine existence, but only through the laws of natural belief. We must have a firm faith in God's existence and in His providence before we can establish the divine authority of the Scriptures. And we must also have a firm faith in the spirituality of man, his immortality, the connection of his destiny in the future with his conduct here, or we can see no need of the Scriptures, and therefore can have no faith in a revelation from God. And one must find his own study of human nature, his study of himself, confirmatory of the assertions of the Bible as to human guilt and corruption, or he will not believe in the need of a divine sacrifice for sin. And with the loss of this doctrine, the divinity of Christ, the doctrines of atonement and regeneration lose their practical importance, and then drop out from the popular faith.

It requires only observation and a knowledge of history to assure us, that a false philosophy on questions of right, wrong, and guilt, leads to wrong interpretations of the Scriptures, and a creed which our churches must most decidedly reject.

I do not intend to affirm that those who undervalue system in theology must hold to essential error, but I believe they are kept from error by those who are stronger in soul than themselves, those whose spirits are exercised more deeply on questions which the Bible does not discuss directly, but on which still it is founded. Those who despise creeds are an easy prey to infidelity, or at least to skepticism. Those who hold that the Bible is a sufficient creed, will have but imperfect views of inspiration, of the character of Christ, of the need of regeneration, and finally, of Christian virtue.

Nor is there any gain even for the rhetorical or the poetical preacher in abjuring system in his theology. He must, when he comes to speak of the truths of the Scriptures, say, "I believe," "I so understand the word of God," "It is in this way that I interpret that which is revealed." He therefore

merely substitutes his *own* creed for that of the apostles, or that of Nice, or that of Westminster. Those who hear any one speak must really listen to a creed, and the only question for us is this: Shall we carefully survey the doctrines as they have been held and taught by the wise and pious men of the Church, and select as the outlines of our faith what they have coincided in teaching, or shall we prefer the creed of one who confessedly has no creed but such as he chances to adopt from a desultory and often not very devout reading of the Scriptures?

2. The preacher will find systematic theology an essential aid to him in understanding human nature. There has been among preachers some cant and some vanity, and a good deal of indulgence in light reading, having this apology, and no other, that their duty was to understand human nature. Still it is important that the preacher should, like his Master, know what is in men; and he does not lose his time if he walks through the lower streets of the city to see the ragged children playing upon the pavement, nor in riding through the rural districts to catch the feelings of the industrious population of the country and to allow his sympathies to be kindled by their wants. He will find advantage in mingling with the people at their social gatherings and in making numerous pastoral calls. He will find profit in a careful study of Shakespeare; and may, if he have the manliness to read as a master, not as a slave, be greatly benefited by reading works of fiction. But he will learn more of human nature from the Bible than from any other book, and will find himself penetrating more deeply into the human soul by a systematic array of Bible teachings on particular traits of character, than by simply reading a chapter of the Bible as the book opens before him. The great essential traits of character are those which men deny to be theirs, not those most readily accepted as being human. They are traits which we do not dare at once to attribute to men, and which we only confess as belonging to all of us, after a watchful and humiliating experience in life.

The study of human nature generally means a study of the ways to please children, of the ways to interest those thinking of the gayeties of life, of the way to win popular favor by pandering to the caprices or flattering the vanities of men; but we gain only a transient and superficial hold of men by such means. There are deeper things in human nature "than are dreamed of in such a philosophy." There are characteristics of the race, the attributing of which to men wins for the time no favor for the preacher. There are facts having relation to our being, our duty, and our destiny, which on their first proclamation by the messenger of God, are denied, but which become moving powers at last, if they are constantly pressed upon the attention of a community. What novelist, what dramatist would teach total depravity, God's sovereign election of His saints, salvation without works, desert of eternal punishment, dependence on God's Spirit for all godliness of soul? No one would dare to teach such doctrines unless he were warranted in it by a careful study of the Word of God, unless he found that a scheme of doctrines, of which these are a part, accorded with the revelation from heaven.

But he who accepts these truths as fundamental in human nature will find them effective in preaching to the people. They will not be the means by which he flatters them; he will in this way catch no applause from saying to his audience what they desire to hear, but he will teach them what they *do not* know of themselves, and finally will convince them that he utters truths taught by Him who with His own hand has formed the soul. Those who have preached with most effect in our churches give full testimony that the soul of man responds to these revealed truths. Our deeper convictions against the purpose and the feelings yet assert that God knows the soul better than the soul knows itself. Those who finally submit to God accept the words of Christ, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." The best of men see, while they have not descended to the cruelties which the novelist por-

trays, nor indulged the passion of an Othello or a Macbeth, that they have exhibited such depravity as to be compelled to say with Paul, "In me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing."

It is evident, from the nature of the case, that for the student of human nature theology must be the best means of access to the heart. Other sciences relating to man, as intellectual or moral philosophy, are abstract, but theology is practical. We hardly attempt to speak of the character of God in our theology, except as He reveals Himself to men. We admit at once that God, in Himself, is beyond our comprehension. We confine our thoughts to man in his relation to God, and to God in His disclosures of Himself to His creatures. Our study, then, hardly for a moment loses sight of man, and is confined mainly to those important elements of his being which bring him into relation with his Creator. The thoughts which occupy the student of theology are those which have interested the best minds of all ages, and yet awaken the deepest feelings of the unlettered—of those busy with worldly occupations—of mothers—of children. Whither are we going? and to whom are we to give account for the deeds done in the body? These are questions which must ever interest every sober mind. These are practical questions which experience presses upon every one, and around them cluster all the discussions of systematic theology.

The student in theology may therefore rest assured that his science is the central one—the one illustrated by all the others. He has a right to assume that all the legitimate aims of other science must be subordinate to that to which he attends. He may assume, so far as other sciences promote human weal (and they do it most efficiently), that they promote the interests of man in those departments of life where *he* studies man as a creature and subject of God.

How nearly like trifling does it seem, then, to say that the preacher should study human nature—the meaning of the

assertion being, he should neglect theology and read stories! How childish does it seem that a preacher should imagine he is to secure a stronger and more permanent hold of his congregation by becoming a master of those arts that provoke a smile or that surprise those who look for soberness in the pulpit, than by becoming master of those doctrines which sway men against their will, and which interest the mind, because every mind of every age is warned by life and by death to study them?

The last topic leads me to remark :

3. A knowledge of systematic theology is the best guide in *applying* the gospel to men as the "power of God unto salvation." I do not intend to assert that sermons which are formal discussions of doctrines are most effective in the conversion of sinners. But the preacher who is master of the doctrines, who is familiar with their relations, with the objections to them, and with the arguments which support them, the minister who carries these all in his mind as his own ready thoughts, without being aware to whom he is indebted for them, nor where he obtained *this* view and where *that*, such a preacher is best able to wield the Gospel as a power.

Paul said: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation." And the careful reader of the Bible has not much doubt how Paul preached the Gospel. No one has been more deeply moved by the love of Christ, no one in the history of the Church has been under stronger constraint from it, yet he did not preach the love of Christ as some now preach it. He did not attempt to move the sympathies of his hearers by telling how Christ was rejected by those whom He tried to serve, was crucified by those whom He would have gathered as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings. He tells us wherein its power lay, immediately after declaring it to be the power of God, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed." And this righteousness he sets over against the unrighteousness and ill-

desert of the sinner, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." He then proceeds to portray the wickedness of the heathen world in words which set the first chapter of Romans, as a literary production, by the side of the most powerful pages of Dante or Milton. The corruptions of Rome came before the apostle's mind, the vices of Corinth, the sensuality of Ephesus, and his thoughts were drawn away from the tenderness and sorrow of even the man of Nazareth, as he thought of the guilt and woe of men and their remedy in the righteousness of God. Christ's work as a whole, as a power, as a force in the government of God, as a remedy for the unrighteousness of man, led him to forget the pathetic scenes, the particular occurrences of the earthly life of our Saviour.

If we read the Acts of the Apostles carefully and mark there the sketches of Paul's sermons, and follow him in his work till we find its summation, its fruitage in his Epistles, we shall be convinced that he preached doctrines, that he was guided by a system, that it was Christ promised in the Old Testament, typified by the sacrifices of Judaism, Christ offering Himself once for all, the cross and the resurrection that he preached.

And when we see what the Gospel is doing for the world, what it is appointed to do, we can have no doubt that the changes which men are to undergo, are to be connected with their faith rather than their feelings, that the Gospel realizes its mission by introducing new *principles* into the heart, rather than by awakening tenderer sympathies. The Gospel is like leaven hid in meal. The mass which before was an aggregation of separate and unrelated particles becomes a unit under its power, is united by a common, an internal bond, a bond which is a principle of life, and the mass is so transformed that it obviously exists for new purposes, and is appointed to a new destiny.

By what kind of preaching is society most effectually

leavened? The reply is one on which there can be little hesitation. The truth has in any case the effect of leaven, only when it is enforced by the Spirit of God, and the question is this then, what truths proclaimed by the preacher, does the Spirit of God most readily and most powerfully set forth by his own demonstration? It is those truths for the most part, presented in a popular form, which we have embodied in our catechisms, and which good men have selected as the fundamental truths of the Bible and of Christian experience. I do not deny that children are often converted without being theologically instructed by the Spirit of God. But, if really *converted*, they are subsequently subjected to the teachings of the Holy Ghost, so that it remains true that the transforming influences of the Spirit, those influences which make the power of the Gospel effective on the community, are in harmony with, and in furtherance of, the great doctrines of Christianity.

Mature minds, religiously impressed, strongly moved by the spirit of God, are taught Christian doctrines, even if human instructors have not brought them before the mind. Though regeneration is connected with varied external circumstances, and the Spirit works, as the wind blows, as it listeth, still there is a strange uniformity, almost a monotonous uniformity in the processes through which minds pass in their first religious experiences. The *steps* in the progress are almost the same in every case, though in one instance one may be more marked, and in another another. Conversion almost always implies the following process: The mind becomes thoughtful, serious questions press themselves *uninvited* upon the attention; the soul, its obligations, its kindred, its true home, its mission in the flesh, these are the themes of contemplation. The convictions which reflection brings are followed by pride, the determination to take heaven as his own acquisition, his own by right; a pride which rejects aid, most of all aid given as mere grace and in a way to please

the giver. To this succeeds conscious rebellion against God. He who will not gratify our pride is opposed as unjust, His government, sovereign and by decree, is condemned and defied; but finally the humble mind succeeds to this warfare, and the soul casts itself on Christ, trusting simply to His mercy.

Now, this process is an experience of systematic theology. The distinctive doctrines of our religion are involved in the change which we have here noticed. Here is God's electing love, the power of the Holy Spirit, the sinner's selfishness, his rebellion, his ill-desert, his remorse, his penitence, his faith, his justification. Whatever else belongs to a system of Christian doctrine is either preparatory to the presentation of these fundamental points, or the result of these truths of experience, manifested in the sanctification of the believer, and in the establishment of the kingdom of God.

We say, then, that the Spirit of God as He works for the salvation of men, impresses on the world convictions which are akin to, indeed identical with, the doctrines of our theology. And now it requires but a glance to see that inasmuch as the theologians interpret the Scriptures by the teaching of the Spirit, and adapt their doctrines more and more to His demonstrations, a true system of theology must consist of those truths which the Spirit teaches. I might, therefore, give as my conclusion the converse of the statement with which I began this point, and instead of saying, "a knowledge of systematic theology is the best guide in applying the Gospel;" say, the Spirit's application of the Gospel is the source of theological doctrine. But since doctrines are the product of history, and are not the result of any one day's presentation of the truth by that Spirit who worketh with each one severally as He will, we shall find a guide to the Spirit's work, as a whole in the condensed statement of His varied works, as it is presented in the creeds and catechisms of the Church.

4. Familiarity with Christian doctrines is one of the important preparations for continued pastoral work in the same

church. I assume it, as granted by all, that *long* pastorates are desirable. They give so much character to the church and so much to the pastor, that their mere *length* becomes a power. The association of a minister's name with a town becomes a sermon and an argument both in one. Edwards of Northampton, Emmons of Franklin, Merrill of Middlebury, Porter of Farmington, are christian phrases which speak to the people of our churches as no books can, as no words from the pulpit can. I shall not attempt to draw out the contents of those expressions, but every one feels that they have a meaning. And we are losing much of the power of the Gospel in that the processes are not more generally going forward which link the names of our ministers with the places where they do their work. Those men whom I have named, and many others who might be referred to, while with heart-ache and weary brain they were attempting to do the work to which they were specially called, were unconsciously doing a work hardly less important, as they slowly forged that little word "*of*" which bound their names to their homes, rather, perhaps, their homes to their names. There is a work done for generations when Hopkins is transformed into Hopkins of Newport, or Hawes into Hawes of Hartford.

Still a long pastorate is one of the most difficult of human achievements. It often becomes wise that the pastoral relations should cease. It can not be profitably continued when the preacher fails to excite fresh interest in his presentation of truth, nor when he ceases to be a centralizing power for the religious community—a power by which the members of the church, with their families, and the better portions of community are attracted to the house of God, and are led to value religious institutions. This is, therefore, much more needed than mere knowledge of Christian doctrine to fit a man for a long pastorate. But such knowledge is one important qualification. It enables the preacher to present the truths of the Gospel so as to secure intense attention to a single point with-

out becoming himself a man of one idea, and without fatiguing the people by the monotony of his discourses. Systematic theology takes in a broad range of doctrine. It affords occasion to address almost all the emotions of the soul. After it has taxed the intellect to its utmost power, it appeals to the feelings. It enforces the importance of its truths through hopes and through fears alike ; through the promises of eternal joy, as well as by the terrors of the Lord.

The power of the pulpit, especially the power of one man for years with one congregation, depends very much upon the breadth of his views, the variety of his teachings, the compass of the sentiments and feelings which he brings into his service. Those who have been *known* as doctrinal preachers, and with that reputation have acquired also the reputation of dullness, have generally had favorite doctrines, and have failed of that full mastery of the system of truths for which we plead. Any one thing tires. Yet even such doctrinal preaching is better than any other equally monotonous. The monotony of truth is far better than the monotony of artifice. Wit and wag-gery, which sometimes please the simple, soon become nau-seous in the pulpit. Schemes of labor by committees or associations become wearisome as they become stale. These things can not hide poverty of thought. They can not long make an unmeaning pulpit tolerable. Truth, though uniform and monotonous, is the best foundation for pulpit power ; and when presented as multiform and fitted to address every living soul, it becomes not simply tolerable, it becomes attractive. It makes the pulpit the pride of the people, a monument to the glory of God.

A perfect preacher, (such an one we shall never know but in idea,) would, I suppose, attract no attention by personal peculiarities. He would not attempt to satisfy a merely critical taste, neither would he defy criticism ; but he would forestall it. He would make it out of place. He would lead his hearers to forget themselves and himself, and waken such in-

terest in the truth, that all else would be forgotten. Now, if the ordinary preacher would approach this result, the Christian doctrines afford him the best means. The *truths* we preach are as important as those which Paul preached. An angel could speak of nothing better for men than salvation by Christ. And it is wholly out of place to say that in our day men do not listen to doctrine as they once did. It may be true, but the fault is in the preacher. Men listen to anything which interests them. The reason our congregations do not let us preach what Emmons preached, is because we do not preach as he would. He would not to-day preach wholly as he did sixty years ago; but he would preach the same truths, and his hearers to-day would be just as docile as they were then. And if our preachers would but thoroughly appropriate and digest, and assimilate Christian doctrine, so possess themselves of it, that they could present it easily, openly or covertly, in the argument or in the application, they would acquire one of the essential requisites of a long pastorate like that of Emmons. They would be able so to present the truth, that it would *seem* fresh, and of present importance. The hearer would forget that he had ever heard it before. He would be oblivious to time and manner. His old preacher would be a new preacher to him.

5. The study of the doctrines of the church is of the first importance to those entering upon the Christian ministry, because it gives them an acquaintance with the ruling thoughts of the church, and a familiarity with its commanding thinkers. One of the dangers of a preacher is, that he will be an imitator. He has the feeling that such a popular preacher has something better to say than he has. We are very apt to attempt the manners of those who have been successful, and to adopt their style in the hope of securing also their power. But imitation, at least as a conscious effort of culture, should be left to childhood. When we become men we should put away childish things. Yet the preacher does need to be sustained by the

consciousness that he knows what he is to speak, and knows what it is which is the power of God unto salvation. It will increase his composure and confidence to feel that no one has higher truths to proclaim than those which he utters; that no one has any clearer statements of truth than those which he can give to his congregation.

Sentiments like these, the youngest and most modest preacher may entertain. He has the sacred word, which is the fountain of religious instruction, and he has the interpretation of the word by men who have long held posts of authority in the Church of God. It is true that the preacher should go primarily to the Word of God for his message, and he should go, too, with the feeling that God may yet disclose from it new views of truth, and of His government, which shall cheer and bless His people. But he should go, as I have already remarked, feeling that his catechism may be a great aid in interpreting the Scriptures, gratefully acknowledging the fact, that God has raised up as his teachers many who have loved the Word of God, and not explored its depths in vain.

In such circumstances, the young preacher may satisfy himself that he has the best aids in his work which can be afforded; that no one can present more important truths than those which it falls to him to preach. Surely this sentiment is well founded. Those minds which have given themselves to Christian doctrine rule the church. The genius of the poetical preacher has not carried the people of God away from the influence of the logical thinker. It is on doctrine that the kingdom of God rests, and by doctrine it grows. The Spirit which inspired Isaiah to say, "The word of our God shall stand forever," taught Moses to utter, as the words of Jehovah, "Hear O earth, the words of my mouth, my doctrine shall drop as the rain." The Church is no more truly founded on a creed than watered by it. There have been men like Whitfield who have moved the Church powerfully for a time; there have been mystic dreamers whose writings have lulled the restless, and

kindled emotions, perhaps, in those who seemed heartless; but when men take their bearings, when after a storm or a calm they wish to know whither they have drifted, they turn to Augustine and Calvin. The preacher may know always that he is discussing important themes, if he discuss those which occupied their minds. The youthful pastor may assure himself that he is bringing before the minds of his hearers the central and perennial themes of religion, if he follow Edwards in the interpretation of God's words. I do not say that any one should adopt the views of Edwards or Calvin, or any other teacher, but I say the thoughts which occupied their minds have been the ruling thoughts in church history. They will continue to be the thoughts which will occupy the Christian mind so long as it is necessary to preach the gospel. There is no mental exercise more expanding, as none is more directly an exercise unto godliness, than to follow, either to confirm or refute, the arguments of such men. It is one of the wonderful facts in the history of the church and the world, that the central and ruling thoughts are few, and that for influence, those men are fortunate who are able to give expression to them. Edwards lives nearer to our day, seems more like a neighbor and companion than Whitefield or Bellamy, because his thoughts are our thoughts. The doctrines which he discussed are the perennial doctrines of Christendom. John Calvin died the year Shakspeare was born. No one attributes to the theologian the genius of the poet, and Shakspeare wrote in our own language. Yet Calvin seems far more like a cotemporary than Shakspeare, for his thoughts never can become obsolete; and Calvin's influence on the civilization of the age is manifold that of Shakspeare, because he interpreted and enforced for the Reformation those truths which God has ordained to be the *practical* truths of life. And it is with such truths, those which Calvin and Edwards have spoken, that we, as students of theology, are called to imbue our minds and hearts.

6. Familiarity with doctrine is useful to the preacher, because

of its influence on character. There is a power which theological seminaries can not bestow upon the pastor, that is, ministerial character. I am aware that of late some of our religious teachers have sought to avoid the ministerial air. I do not know but the time may come when for a short period the prevalent ministerial trait will be levity. In other words, the reaction from too great austerity may have the effect of making the ministerial character unministerial,—the opposite of what common sense would dictate. But whatever may be the temporary aberrations from sound judgment, there is a character befitting the sacred office. And that character is a power in the community. It preaches, it teaches, it calms, it cheers. It does not harm the frivolous, though they may sometimes feel it to be a weight; it is of much value to the despondent, because it is to them a relief. It lifts anxiety from their shoulders; it imparts buoyancy to the heart.

Especially in the discharge of the ministerial office is the pastor obliged to rest often upon his character. He must preach with authority, *i. e.*, he must say many things which he can not stop to prove. He must, by his own impressions and convictions, infuse into his hearers a solemn appreciation of truths which he can not by cold argument make effective. He must, also, as a teacher, speak with confidence, being supported by his own faith and his own convictions. The preacher has, in some respects, a most difficult office. No man is so sensible of human weakness, of personal unworthiness, as he. No one works with such a consciousness of dependence on a higher power, and yet no one has a better right to work with hope of success. It requires much of self-culture, much of divine grace, I may say, to work, having in constant exercise all those feelings, resisting the excessive influence of each one. A perfectly well-balanced ministerial character is rare; it must be so when its demands are so great. But we must as preachers seek for this best of gifts. And the preacher without

character is no *preacher*. He may be a rhetorician, he may be an orator, he is not a preacher of the Gospel.

But the point to which I wish to call attention is this: in the culture of character, familiarity with the Christian doctrines is one of the best aids. He who contemplates the sovereignty of God, and who makes it a practical truth, that in God he lives, and moves, and has his being, must live under the awe of an overshadowing Presence, and needs no other lessons upon Christian humility. Yet he who sees clearly that all knowledge is a seeing in the light which God gives, and that there is no power but of God, can go from his own study, from communion with God in prayer, and feel assured that the truths he speaks are as worthy as any which God reveals. He can speak the Word boldly, as he ought to speak. The combination of boldness and humility has been a marked trait of character in Christian preachers ever since the days of the Apostles. It is worth one's while to read Edwards on the Will, for the simple purpose of noticing the remarkable union of these two qualities in him. The result flows naturally from long contemplation of, vivid realization of, the doctrines of our religion. Taken together they are well fitted to produce both a sense of weakness and of strength, of self-confidence and self-distrust, of awe and of boldness, of timidity and of assurance, of certain knowledge and of uncertainty as to what a day may bring forth. And when one has these traits, and such as these, the constituents of his character, so that they utter forth themselves and are felt by all whom he meets, as a preacher of the Gospel he has within his reach an eloquence rhetorical arts can not give him.

7. It is worth while to notice briefly that the tendencies of the age warn us against a lax and uncertain theology. Those who are the professed and accredited teachers of religion will only disgrace themselves and their profession if they preach to amuse, to fascinate, to persuade even, if they do not also

instruct. The age is an intellectual one,—one of ambitious exertion in the lower departments of intellectual work. Our thinkers are not now in the habit of consulting the Reason, as that faculty is distinguished from the understanding, but are most industrious in putting their knowledge into a scientific form. They are not patiently waiting for the voice of God, are not anxiously contemplating truth for the enlargement of the premises from which their conclusions are to be drawn, but are systematizing, as best they can, following the dictates of the understanding, classifying, drawing conclusions, and mapping out sciences.

Theology is in danger of being split up into parts, and there is even danger that there will be left no residue at the heart to go under this ancient name. Among the subjects formerly treated of in systems of theology was "the works of God," and the creation of the world was ascribed to Him. But at present geology assumes to interpret the first chapter of Genesis, and some of the geologists would withdraw the story of creation from theology. The encroachments of other sciences upon this one, which seemed once in a loose way to embrace them all, are not less real than that of geology. Physiology, as taught by some of its professors, contradicts the theological doctrine of the unity of the human race. Rationalism assumes the honor of modern civilization, of the decay of superstition, and the elevation of the more enlightened nationalities. Political economy seems to desire, perhaps to design, to excuse God from a watchful care over His creatures. The science of government is seeking another source of power than God. The science of social ethics is searching by induction for the laws of crime and virtue, and claims a historic progress which, if continued in the future, will secure the millennium without the aid of the Christian religion. In the midst of activities such as these the theologians must not be inactive. It is true they have no special occasion for fear. We are all seeking the truth together. The advocates of all these sciences are our

friends, many of them determined friends, all of them promoting interests in which we have part. But those who believe the Bible, and hold to the system of salvation by the Cross, must not be idle. It becomes them to understand their own science, to be ready for its defense and to demand for it the respect of thinking men, as well as the confidence of the people. And we should bear in mind, too, that we shall gain nothing by a mock liberality, nothing by granting too much to natural science. We ought to have our creeds at such a time full and rounded, and to occupy openly all the ground we claim. In this way we shall be best prepared to meet an enemy, and in this way we shall best please the friends of theologic truth.

Let me say in conclusion, a Seminary occupying the position which this does should teach a distinctly pronounced Christian theology. The denomination with which this institution is connected has in the Eastern States spoken its opinions freely and boldly. And now that the inhabitants of newer States prefer to bring with them their churches and their schools, let us see that neither of them suffer by the transfer. New England is a name connected with theology. The sons of New England should not allow her reputation to suffer, either at home or among the diverse populations of the newer States. Moreover, the leading ministers in the Congregational churches in the East have exhibited no uncertain or feeble tendencies in their theological speculations. In zeal, in rapid growth, in earnest piety, other denominations will not yield to them the pre-eminence, but it will doubtless be cordially granted by all in the religious fraternity of our country that the Congregationalists have most loved doctrinal discussion, have sought most persistently to solve the difficult problems of theology, and have done most in modifying theological thought and theological language.

And if, in our day, we are rather wearied than edified by the literature so largely occupied with exercises and taste, with

ability and the highest good, still let us be aware that we are under obligation to those who lingered over these terms with so much affection, and let us remember that we shall cease from all religious affinity with New England when we cease to be interested in the doctrines of Christian theology.

ARTICLE II.

THE NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS.*

To the uninstructed mind the earth seems an eternal thing. Day follows night, the seasons run their course, snow crowns the mountain peak, the ocean rolls its waves, for the old man precisely as when he was a little infant in his mother's arms. As for the sun, it is the same blazing orb which his remotest ancestors have worshiped. The moon loses nothing from the perfection of its disc. Save only a few errant planets, or an occasional comet, the stars are neither brighter nor dimmer than they were of old. The universe is eternal: its matter, at least, has existed forever, said the ancient philosophers. But can we conceive all this matter thus self-existent from all eternity? We are forced by the laws of mind to believe that every finite thing must proceed from some definite cause. The matter of the universe is finite. It must have been caused by something greater than itself; and, since no finite thing can be greater than the universe, its cause must have been infinite. This *infinite cause* we call The Creator. And since, logically speaking, the Creator must have existed before the creation, matter can not have endured from all eternity; though, in point of fact, could it be proved that the creation is the only manifestation of the being of the Creator, we might believe that the two have forever co-existed in time. But here, mathematical science comes to our aid. The mathematician

*Introductory Lecture at Rush Medical College, September 27, 1871.

tells us that the constant uniformity believed in by the superficial observer is no uniformity. By unerring figures he demonstrates the existence of motion among the constituents of the universe. All things are in motion, even though their movements be too slow, or too limited, or too distant, to arrest the attention of ordinary observers. As examples of such movements we may instance (1) the gradual deviation of the earth's axis from the pole-star; (2) the circumscribed vibrations of the atoms which unite in a heated bar of iron; or (3) the far off flight of a sun, like Arcturus, moving fifty four miles a second in a direction at right-angles to our path in space, yet requiring eight hundred years to change its visible position by a distance equal to the apparent diameter of the moon. These motions beget in all things change; and such changes can not have continued from all eternity. Says Maxwell, concerning the diffusion of heat (Address before the British Association—*Nature*, Vol. II., p. 421), "If we attempt to ascend the stream of time by giving to its symbol continually diminishing values we are led up to a state of things in which the formula has what is called a critical value; and if we inquire into the state of things the instant before, we find that the formula becomes absurd. We thus arrive at the conception of a state of things which can not be conceived as the physical result of a previous state of things, and we find that this critical condition actually existed at an epoch not in the depths of a past eternity, but separated from the present time by a finite interval." Again: Prof. Tait, of Edinburgh, addressing the British Association, a few days ago, (*Nature*, Vol. IV., p. 272), upon the results of mathematical investigation, declares that we are enabled "distinctly to say that the present order of things has *not* been evolved through infinite past time by the agency of laws now at work—but must have had a distinctive beginning, a state beyond which we are totally unable to penetrate, a state in fact which must have been produced by other than the now acting causes."

Here, then, we have something tangible for a starting point. If the universe has not always existed as at present, how came it to be as we find it? No man saw its inception; no human being has lived long enough to trace its course by his experience. In the absence of direct knowledge we must answer this question by the aid of such inductions as may become possible. Time was when every one rested content with a misinterpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. Six thousand years ago, the earth began to be; the waters were separated from the firmament; dry land appeared; grass clothed the fields; sun and moon were pasted to the sky; fish, flesh and fowl came forth; six days—and all was done. "But the sea-shells upon the mountains,—the fossils in the rocks,—how came they there?" "Put there ready made," was always a sufficient reply; and any one who doubted of such an interpretation of Scripture was a damnable heretic, fit only to burn here and hereafter. Knowledge of this sort sufficed for the infancy of the race, but a time came when it no longer satisfied the questionings of the thoughtful. Three hundred years ago, when Europe awoke from the slumbers of a thousand years, the problem of the universe was one of the first which pressed the minds of men for a solution. Ever since those days the army of students has continually increased; each one bringing to the common stock his little bundle of facts, until now we are in a fair way to know something definite concerning the life of our earth, at least. And while we can no longer abide the narrow theory of creation expounded by old-fashioned churchmen, we are constrained to admit that every new step in science serves to bring out more fully the literal truth of the magnificent pictorial outline of the Creator's work which is sketched on the first page of the Bible. The picture displays only the work itself; it gives no clue to the proximate causes by which the splendid fabric was produced. The study of those causes involves the study of Natural Science. To that we bend our energies.

Assuming, then, that no one now disputes the theory which assigns to the work of creation a period of unknown length, during which the earth slowly advanced toward its present condition, it may be well for us to consider by what steps the present stage of development has been attained. Since there is no detailed history of the development of the universe, we are compelled to conjecture its method after considering the results of the activity of the forces by which we now find matter kept in motion. Could those results be fully traced, we should possess the key to the whole process; but the investigations of scientific men have not yet penetrated far into the gloomy realm of the unknown, and consequently when we would account for any given series of phenomena, we are often driven to the use of *hypothesis*—that is, an *ingenious approximation to the truth*, for want of the truth itself. Such hypotheses are esteemed in proportion to their capacity for connecting facts and for stimulating inquiry. When they can no longer accomplish these functions, they soon give place to something stronger—something better.

Of the various hypotheses of the Creation, which have been advanced, two powerful rivals have contended for the mastery, viz., the Special Creation hypothesis and the Evolution hypothesis. With the outlines of the first, you are all, doubtless well acquainted, for it is only an attempted amplification of the literal Bible narrative. It maintains the doctrine of a Creator who works upon matter in human fashion. When this Creator was ready, He formed the earth by the word of His power. At the right time, He made and placed upon the earth the first plant, the first animal, the first man. These facts no one denies, but the hypothesis is defective, because it leaves out of consideration all natural causes, by means of which these first beginnings may have been made to appear. Michael Angelo, in his great painting of the Creation, gave this hypothesis pictorial expression under the form of an old man with venerable beard, kicking stars and planets into exis-

tence by a series of well-considered extensions of the great toe. Reduced to this form, the idea exposes its own absurdity, and an attempt has, therefore, been made to bridge the chasm between our knowledge and our ignorance by the production of what has been called the Nebular hypothesis. The hypothesis itself is no new thing. Under various forms, it has occupied the attention of philosophers ever since the birth of science. Connected with false schemes of philosophy, and pressed into the service of skepticism and atheism, it has incurred unlimited opprobrium. And yet it lives, it explains phenomena otherwise unintelligible; it stimulates investigation beyond any other theory of the universe; it daily receives new support from scientific progress. If not true, it deserves to be true.

What, then, is this much vaunted hypothesis? I will endeavor, as briefly as possible, to set forth its leading features, reserving for other lectures the majority of the facts which contribute its chief support.

THE HYPOTHESIS.

In the beginning, the atoms of matter were created, and were diffused throughout space. Penetrating an eternal future, the omniscient Creator endowed each atom with energies, enabling it always to fulfill its part in the grand scheme of a universe which was to grow, not by chance, but in accordance with a single definite plan, namely, the orderly manifestation of the being of an Infinite Intelligence. All possible relations and permutations of atoms were foreseen and provided for, else how could all things have been *fore-ordained*, as the theologians say! But, because these atoms were thus richly endowed, it does not follow that they were always exhibiting their gifts. Energy has two states. It may be either *potential* or *actual*. By *actual energy*, we are at once impressed. *Potential energy* may exist forever, and in no way affect our intelligence. For example, let us suppose infinite space cleared

of all ordinary matter, and then let ^{a portion} an atom of hydrogen or of oxygen be projected into the vacuum. It would be discovered to possess energies through whose action would be maintained definite size, shape and, probably, motion of its parts around a central point. That such a body might display other forms of energy could, by no means under the circumstances, be even suspected by any uninitiated finite intelligence. But let another similar atom be projected into space, and at once a new form of energy reveals itself. The atoms move toward each other. This is attraction hitherto *potential*, now *actual* on the part of the first created mass. And when collision occurs, this actual energy of motion instantly becomes again potential through the cessation of movement; and new forms of energy appear, capacitated to produce sensations of heat, of light, or of electricity. In like manner, it has been discovered that chemical energy does not manifest itself between different elements at exalted temperatures. In the heated atmosphere of the sun, it appears that the elements exist uncombined and separate from each other. If, then, we only knew matter as existing at an extremely elevated temperature, it would be impossible for us to suspect that a lower temperature would reveal a chemical affinity between oxygen and potassium. Yet to an infinite intelligence, nothing could be all the while more clear. So, when the proper temperature has disclosed the affinity between such elements, we do not say that under other conditions it did not exist, but we say that under those conditions, the affinity was potential. In other words, that the atoms of oxygen and of potassium were so created that when neither too hot nor too cold, they would be drawn so closely together, that a new form of matter, *oxide of potassium*, would be the result. And, moreover, when we have studied all the forms of matter, and the present conditions of their existence, it will not be wise for us to assume that we have awakened all the potential energies of their atoms. We are utterly ignorant of all that their future relations may unfold.

From this analysis, then, we learn that evolution is the movement of atoms through all the permutations of which they are capable. It is the conversion of potential energy into actual energy. It is the manifestation of the latent forces with which the atoms were endowed at the moment of their creation.

Returning now to the Nebular hypothesis, let us suppose a definite space filled with such atoms, smallest of masses, floating freely in the illimitable ether. The first apparent consequence would be their movement towards each other. This we see illustrated by the formation of tangible drops of water out of the molecules of watery vapor, which float invisibly in the atmosphere. Attraction brings together the molecules, and the resulting drop is spherical, because no other form can express the mutual attractions of its constituent parts. But, since by reason of the action of outside forces which modify its shape, we never find a rain-drop which is a perfect sphere; so in the nebulous clusters, which would result from the aggregation of atoms, we should at first discover only the manifestations of a general tendency towards the spherical form; and the universe would consist of an indefinite number of cloudy masses or nebulae, assuming irregular forms, in each one of which constant changes would progress as a consequence of the continued approximation of its constituent atoms. This approximation would present the appearance of movement towards the center of the nebula: and since each nebula would, in like manner, be attracted by every other nebula, these larger masses would all gravitate towards their common center. These attractions, did they operate in a vacuum, would, in a given time, bring all matter by the nearest path to its highest degree of condensation at the center of the universe. But various phenomena compel us to suppose that the cosmical spaces are not empty. They are filled with *ether*, a form of matter far more attenuated than the atoms with which we have been dealing. This ether must in

terpose a certain resistance to the movement of atoms. This resistance will prevent the nebulae from at once assuming a completely spherical form, and will also impede their motion towards the universal center of attraction. According to the law of mechanical motion, the immediate resultant of the attraction of the atoms by each other on the one hand, and the resistance of the ether on the other, would be a movement of rotation by the atoms of the nebulae around their common center, and, in like manner, a corresponding rotation of the nebulae around the center of universal gravitation.

Another conspicuous result of the movements thus established would be the evolution of heat and light. The approximation of atoms predicates their final collision; and by collision, in a way which future lectures will explain, the atoms are heated, and may increase their heat till they become luminous. The nebulae would thus become visible to a human eye. According to laws of molecular motion, which will be hereafter discussed, the light and heat thus evolved would increase in proportion to the approximation of the atomic units. Consequently, the mutual attraction of the atoms of a nebula, causing it to contract its dimensions and to rotate with accelerating velocity, would also cause it to grow continually hotter and brighter. And since the atoms most distant from the axis of rotation, being compelled to move with the greatest velocity, would experience the greatest resistance, the nebula would tend to assume the form of a spheroid, of which the poles would become more and more flattened as the mass diminished its volume. The resistance encountered by the equatorial atoms would at length exceed the attraction which had drawn them towards the center, and they would separate from the spheroid into the form of a revolving ring. Such a ring might, under certain difficult conditions, continue to rotate outside of the spheroid from which it was derived; but, in all probability, it would break up into fragments, which would assume the spheroidal shape, and would continue to

revolve around the central orb. All this while the revolving mass would be losing light and heat. Rings and satellites would cool faster than the primaries by which they were generated. Consequently, they would pass from the gaseous state to the liquid, and from the liquid state to the solid, while their source might remain a sphere of incandescent gas. But sooner or later, the flaming center itself must cool down. Resistance to gravitation must correspondingly diminish. Every atom must reach its ultimate destination. System after system must concentrate upon the center of the cosmos, leaving darkness once more to pervade the infinite space.

Such, in its most abstract form, is the Nebular Hypothesis. Originally presented as an hypothesis, it is now assuming the proportions of a well established theory. For many years, it was opposed by the assertion that, when armed with a powerful telescope, the eye could resolve into separate stars many of those luminous clouds which, like fragments of the *milky way*, are scattered over the sky. Were the hypothesis correct, it was urged, the heavens should disclose the existence of masses of vapor, which had not been condensed into stars. When it was insisted, that many such were revealed by the telescope, it was replied, that since every increase in the power of a telescope served to resolve into distinct points of light a greater number of the nebulae, a sufficiently powerful lens would display the constituent stars in every one of those dimly-shining cloudlets that float so far away upon the confines of the universe. When the great telescopes of Lord Rosse, in Ireland, and of the Cambridge Observatory, in our own country, had resolved into stars a portion of the splendid nebula in Orion, the advocates of the nebular hypothesis, who had always relied much upon the irresolvability of this nebula, as one of the pillars of their belief, were compelled to hang their heads. This was in A. D. 1846. The hypothesis seemed to have received its death-blow. It remained little better than a curious relic of ancient speculation, until the

recently discovered method of spectroscopic investigation opened an entirely new field of research. Seven years ago (A. D. 1864), an English astronomer, Mr. Huggins, undertook to analyze the light of the nebulae. By a method, which will be set forth in another lecture, he determined the fact, that, while many of the nebulae are, indeed, simple clusters of closely aggregated stars, there are many others which are mere masses of flaming gas, uncondensed, and incandescent elementary atoms, ranging themselves upon the line of evolution; clouds of luminous vapor, gathering in the depths of space, to the birth of suns and stars without number.

Thus the nebular hypothesis has become the dominant theory of the Universe. Viewed in its light, the evolution of our own little solar system is lifted into a direct relation with the growth of every other system in the Creation. In every portion it gives evidence of progressive condensation of matter. We find the larger planets at distances from the sun, which satisfy the requirements of the hypothesis; and we also find them less condensed than the more central and more slowly moving planets. Jupiter, with a volume 1400 times greater than our earth, is but 338 times as heavy, or one-third heavier than a like volume of water; while Saturn, with a volume 776 times larger than the earth, is but 100 times as heavy, *i. e.* its specific gravity is not greater than that of oak or of sulphuric ether. This, too, is a fact which might be anticipated, in accordance with the theory, for the surface of a small sphere is much greater, in proportion to its volume, than the surface of a large sphere. The small planets, consequently, lose heat more rapidly than the large; and they pass more rapidly through the different stages of evolution. The moons which revolve around the larger planets, are more concentrated than the primaries from which they were thrown off. They have lived faster than their parents, and have fallen into premature old age. Upon a surface, scarred by fire and seared by water, our moon presents abundant evi-

dence of its community of origin with the earth; but, at present, no signs of lunar fire or water, or even of any atmosphere can be discovered. Those enormous volcanoes have ceased to vomit flame. Those oceans of water have vanished into the caverns of the interior. So eagerly does every moveable particle tend towards the center of gravity, that the air itself has disappeared among the solid elements of the orb. Organic life finds no place in that desert, nor can it possibly exist under the conditions presented by such a world. It is a voiceless, lifeless, sphere, waiting only for the day which shall mingle again its atoms with the atoms of its mother earth.

Passing hastily over the numerous proofs of our hypothesis which are furnished by the conformation of a planet, like Saturn, with numerous moons and manifold rings, which have not been condensed into yet more satellites, let us briefly consider the transformations which our earth must have experienced during a period of evolution, from the condition of a gaseous ring. At first, a whirling ring of luminous vapor, thrown from the surface of the sun, then collapsing into a fiery globe, the earth took its place among the other planets. Parting with matter sufficient to form a moon, the spheroid continued to shrink as it lost heat from its surface. Gradually a liquid layer became condensed between the heated interior and the cooler gases which surrounded the globe. What an extensive atmosphere we then possessed! The oxygen and the hydrogen of water were forming clouds in the air—such clouds as will never again be rolled together around this ball. The molten surface cooled, at length, below the boiling point of water, and the ocean began to cover the face of the earth. Obedient to the law of gravitation, whenever the fiery subterranean tides disturbed the level of the solid crust, vast bodies of water were displaced, and set in violent motion. The radiant heat of the sun, which, too, is ever dispersing itself as a consequence of the continual approach of solar matter towards its center, served to establish a constant circulation of air and

water, producing winds and currents, and rains and storms. By these means, as the crust of the earth became more uneven, the mountains were worn away, and their dust was scattered over the bed of the sea, forming extensive layers of stratified rock. And, when the slow movement of the geological ages had filled the hollow of the ocean, and had drowned the mountain peaks, these stratified rocks were the foundations of the continents upon which have been displayed the varying phenomena of organic life. Ever since those ancient days, these processes have been continued by the ceaseless tendency of matter towards its common center. That the tendency is still active, we are reminded by the fall of the leaf, by the dropping of the rain, by the rush of the cataract, by the tumult of the earthquake, by the roar of the ocean. Not even the ground beneath our feet is at rest. Whole continents are tilting up, first one side, than another, as they settle into the fiery mass below. Here a mountain chain is pushed upwards, by the sinking of a neighboring coast, There, the everlasting hills are going down at sea, leaving only the white coral reefs to mark their burial-place. Thus it has been, and so it will be until the face of the earth is worn like the face of the moon; until clouds, and air, and sea, have disappeared; until even the dream of the poet shall become a literal fact—

“And like the baseless fabric of a vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve;
And, like this insubstantial pageant, faded,
Leave not a rack behind.”

ARTICLE III.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS CHRIST.

In reading the New Testament histories of the transactions of the Jews and Pilate, which resulted in the crucifixion and death of our blessed Lord, we are accustomed to look at the facts and incidents in their general statement. Perhaps we have not, therefore, sufficiently fixed in mind some points of interest and instruction ascertainable by looking at those transactions in their particular relations to law and justice.

It could not be expected that under the Roman government, in the time of Christ—being, as it was, under the debasing influence of heathenism; nor that under the Jewish government, as having become corrupted through the national degeneracy,—provisions so just and humane as in Christian countries now, should exist and be acted upon. Yet even the Romans were not without some wise and just laws concerning the treatment of crimes. Their courts were such in number, and so constituted, as to give opportunity for a hearing before successive tribunals, and erroneous and unjust decisions delivered in the lower courts might be reviewed and revised in the higher. The Jews themselves might be challenged to point to any laws in the Mosaic code which justified the proceedings had in the case of the Son of God. The Talmudists say that “trials by night were forbidden, and also trials on festival days.” It was also “unlawful to examine a cause, pass sentence, and put it in execution on the same day.” It has been pretended by Jewish historians that forty days were allowed Jesus of Nazareth in which to prepare and make His defense. The pretension, groundless as it is, recognizes the existence of such a rule, or of a usage which had grown into a rule. A distinguished archaeologist has stated that among the Jews “the witnesses were sworn, and in capital cases the parties con-

cerned. Two witnesses were required, beside the accuser; the witnesses were examined separately, in the presence of the accused."

From Daniel vii: 10, it appears probable that in the time of ancient Jewish trials the book of laws was open before the judge. Laws are found in the books of Moses against bribes and gifts to pervert judgment, and also against false testimony. According to Roman law, as administered in the days of the apostles, and as cited by Festus when Paul stood before Agrippa, it was "not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accuser face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crimes laid against him." The accounts of the trials of Paul, Peter and John, before the high priest and elders of Jerusalem, contain evidence that there were rules and usages, having somewhat of propriety in them, for the conduct of trial, and which must have been in existence prior to the trial of Jesus Christ, and they were practiced upon subsequent to that occasion, although disregarded in his case. The apostles were on one occasion cleared and released, even by obviously prejudiced and unwilling judges, while the spotless Son of God was hurried through the forms of trial without the semblance of impartiality, and on the same day condemned and executed as a malefactor.

One important fact should here receive special attention. So far as the Jews acted in reference to Jesus Christ, it is not perceivable that they had at any time the honest purpose of maintaining public justice, ecclesiastical or civil. Their manifest and sole object was to accomplish the destruction of this one man, Jesus Christ. So long previous and so publicly notorious was this fact, that on one of the public national festivals in Jerusalem, previous to His final arrest, men asked, "Is not this He whom they seek to kill?" Jesus himself publicly and repeatedly laid to their charge this, their real and steady design: "Ye seek to kill me;" and challenged them

"Why go ye about to kill me?" They did not deny the charge. In criminal trials in our own time and country, and wherever legislation and the administration of justice have received tone, form and decisiveness under the civilizing influences of Christianity, the sole purpose of a trial is always to ascertain the innocence or the guilt of the accused; to clear him, if innocent, and to punish him according to the requirements of law, if guilty. In the purpose and acts of the Jews concerning Jesus Christ, justice, uprightness and impartiality were "ruled out."

From the garden of Gethsemane, where Jesus was betrayed by Judas and arrested by the officers and soldiers, and in that same night, Christ was "led away to Caiaphas, the high priest, and with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes."

Here, then, is in session the court, Jewish or ecclesiastical, in which is to be commenced the series of trials of the arrested "Jesus of Nazareth." The hour has by some commentators been supposed to have been before morning. Luke writes, "As soon as it was day." It does not appear from either of the evangelists that any specific charges, or any instrument in the nature of an indictment, was presented, or anything formally stated by the presiding priest, or by any one acting in the capacity of prosecutor on behalf of church or state, to which Jesus could reply. This tribunal indeed appears to have opened its session without any legal and precise information on the purpose for which they were assembled, and on the reasons why Jesus Christ was before them as an offender. The doings of that night had been the subject of anticipation in the public mind for a length of time, and the people had, perhaps, come to the knowledge of the essential materials for an indictment, as they lay in the minds of their leaders. It does not, however, speak well for the dignity of the court, nor for the habits of the national officials, that they should proceed in such an important trial without even the form of a legal presenta-

tion of the case. It is also an indication of a greatly increased excitement of the popular feeling against Jesus, that the chief priests and scribes, having been deterred from earlier and more decisive steps on the day before, "lest there should be an uproar among the people," had all at once lost their fears, and were ready for bold steps; they therefore moved forward without regard to any hindrances.

As the first step in the trial of Jesus before Caiaphas, "the high priest asked Jesus of His disciples and of His doctrines," thus making use of the accused as a witness in his own case. The object of the high priest, however, was in the line of the manifest and long-pursued policy of the scribes and Pharisees: "laying wait for Him and seeking to catch something out of His mouth, that they might accuse Him." Jesus answered, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing." Reminding the high priest that his official duty just then lay in a different direction, he added, "Why askest thou Me? Ask them which heard Me what I said unto them; behold they know what I said." Proper and important in the case as was the suggestion, still, inasmuch as it showed Caiaphas to have made a grave mistake, the words of Jesus were taken as an insult. From the dilemma in which the high priest had unfortunately involved himself, relief was sought in a new expedient. Witnesses were sought for, after the opening of the trial; were introduced for "the prosecution" only, and were called to testify as they happened to be found. Whether they were put under oath or adjuration to secure their truthfulness does not appear. By their contradictions of each other however, they aggravated the perplexities of the court, and neutralized the force of their own testimony.

Without arriving at any important issue in the court of the high priest, the trial was removed to the next and higher tribunal, the Sanhedrim, or Jewish Senate, composed of seventy-

two men, over which also Caiaphas presided. The mistake already committed in the court below was repeated in this,—of questioning the accused, without anything presented to the Sanhedrim in the nature of specific charges, on which Jesus was to be tried. Added to this was the new and singular mistake, by the high priest, of calling Jesus to reply before the Sanhedrim, to witnesses who in the previous court had given conflicting testimony. “But Jesus answered nothing.” Persisting in their endeavor to draw from Himself something which could be used against Him: the question was put to Him—“Art thou the Christ? tell us,”—to which He replied affirmatively, and with the solemn warning,—“Moreover I say unto you that hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the throne of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven.” The high priest, in the profession of great astonishment and grief, “rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy. What further need have we of witnesses?”

Observe here, that neither time nor permission were allowed Jesus to prove His declaration of His divine character and authority; nor to present any proofs that He was “the Christ of God.” His plain declaration of Himself as “the Son of God” was made the ground of a new accusation, and of condemnation to death. Nor was there given any further attention to previous accusations. All was haste, precipitation; the excited and impetuous movement of men having before them a favorite object, to be reached at a stride. The most atrocious offender under the laws of a civilized and Christian country is not thus summarily crushed and trampled upon by a court of Justice. Thereupon, “The men that held Jesus mocked Him and smote Him; and when they had blindfolded Him they struck Him on the face, and asked Him, saying—Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote Thee?” “And the servants did strike Him with the palms of their hands.” These proceedings were permitted and countenanced by the Sanhedrim and by the high priest; although they must

have known that,—Jesus being yet to be tried in the Roman courts,—it became the Jews and their officials to be cautious of anticipating a Roman decision, by anything which might be reversed, so that Jesus would be taken out of their hands.

In the then condition of the Jewish nation, as subservient to the Romans, their power did not extend to the infliction of the penalty of death. Their decisions, made in the court of the high priest, and affirmed by the Sanhedrim, must therefore be accepted and confirmed by the Roman governor at Jerusalem, or their favorite object was frustrated. Being scrupulously afraid of ceremonial defilement which would disqualify them for eating the passover, “they themselves went not into the judgment hall” of the Roman governor. This necessitated the governor’s meeting them outside of his customary and proper place for hearing and trying cases, and he courteously refrained from requiring their presence in his hall. He very properly, however expected the presentation of the case before him as having been considered by the high priest and by the Sanhedrim, with their decisions thereon, and the grounds whereof; and this as prefatory to his own review of the whole, in behalf of the Roman government. He therefore inquired,—“What accusation bring ye against this man?” The reply of the Jewish rulers—both uncourteous and insolent—was, “If He were not a malefactor we would not have delivered Him up to thee.” As if to say,—We expect and require that you accept the fact of His presentation before you, as an accused man, to be evidence of His guilt; and to believe that we have acted on reasons worthy of your unquestioning acceptance. The reply of the governor was as strange as their own answer to his question: “Take ye Him and judge Him according to your law.” To this, however, the Jewish magistrates felt impelled to acknowledge, for substance—We have gone to the extent of our prerogatives as enjoyed under the Roman government, and we have come to you simply for a “death warrant” against a man whom we have tried for crime against our laws.

They proceeded next to present a new accusation against Jesus, upon which nothing had been said before the high priest nor the Sanhedrim: "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that He Himself is Christ a King."

This allegation put a new idea into the mind of the governor. Taking no notice of the two first points in this sweeping charge, "Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus," and "asked Him art thou the King of the Jews?" This opened a brief conversation between Jesus and Pilate, in which the latter satisfied himself that the claims, character, and objects of Jesus Christ were in no conflict with the Roman, nor with any other secular kingdom or government, as such. And he appears to have concluded that whatever concern the Jewish nation, as a religious body, might conceive themselves to have in the pretension of Christ, there was not sufficient reason why they had brought the Man before him. He, therefore, returned to the Jews, with the obvious design of putting an estop upon their proceedings, as groundless: and not permitting the Roman government to be in any way involved. "He saith to them, I find in Him no fault." The Jews, however, were resolved that Pilate should not so easily disembarass himself, and thus disappoint their plan for the destruction of Jesus Christ. "They were the more fierce, saying: 'He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee unto this place.'" At the mention of Galilee, Pilate "asked whether the man were a Galilean." Learning that He was, and judging that his case came more properly within the jurisdiction of Herod, who was "tetrarch of Galilee," and Herod himself being at that time in Jerusalem, and Pilate being desirous to free his own hands from any further responsibility in the case, he sent Him to Herod. "And when Herod saw Jesus he was exceeding glad; for he was desirous of seeing Him, of a long season; because he had heard many things of Him; and he hoped to have

seen some miracle done by Him." He "questioned with Him in many words, but Jesus answered him nothing. And the chief priest and scribes stood and vehemently accused Him." Herod being provoked with the silence of Jesus; and his prejudices and ill will against Him becoming roused, instead of requiring the Jews to present their accusations, and prove them before him, entered at once into their hostile feelings. Taking no notice of the case as referred to him in the capacity of tetrarch of Galilee, he at once proceeded to treat Him with public indignity. "With his men of war he set Him at nought, and mocked Him, and arrayed Him in a gorgeous robe, and sent Him again to Pilate."

We have now arrived at the third step in the process of the trial under Roman administration. Herod had done nothing officially which would relieve Pilate and abate his responsibilities. Jesus was returned to him as an accused person, and he must review the Jewish proceedings, and either affirm their sentence, or reverse it, and give his reasons. Either way, he was certain to involve himself in difficulty; with the Jews, on the one hand, or with Caesar on the other, and escape from either point of the dilemma was hopeless. The Jews were unchanged and inflexible; and still Pilate knew that he must answer to Caesar, if he swerved from duty as his representative. Recurring to the fact that at the feast of the passover the governor was "wont to release unto the people one prisoner, whomsoever they desired;" "Pilate saith unto them, I find in Him no fault at all: but ye hold a custom that I should release unto you one at the passover; will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?" He quickly saw that this was not to avail for his relief; for "then cried they all again, saying—Not this man, but Barabbas"; a man who was an insurgent, a robber and a murderer, all in one.

At this point occurred an incident which, for the moment, interrupted the proceedings of the governor. "When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying,

'have thou nothing to do with that just man; for I have suffered many things, this day, in a dream, because of him.'" An appeal, this, adapted to strengthen his publicly declared belief in the innocence of Jesus, and to confirm his determination to shield Him from the vindictive purpose of the Jews, and also to leave Barabbas in the hands of justice for punishment. To this, probably, he had made up his judgment; for calling together the chief priests and rulers of the people, he said unto them: "Ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people; and, behold, I, having examined Him before you, have found no fault in this Man, touching the things whereof ye accuse Him. No, nor yet Herod, for I sent you to him, and lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto Him. I will, therefore chastise Him, and release Him." If Pilate had indulged expectations that, by such a step, he could satisfy the Jewish thirst for the blood of their victim, he met an immediate disappointment. He found that the popular will and determination were in stubborn conflict with his own wishes, judgment and authority. He had, therefore, to succumb to the Jews, or to meet and bear their indignation.

Not to be thwarted and disappointed in their favorite purpose, "the chief priests and elders moved the people that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus." "And they cried out, all at once, saying, away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas." Pilate, still willing to release Jesus, spake again unto them: "Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? Again they shouted their demand for the release of Barabbas, and the death of Jesus. Pilate, with an indecision which anew invited and intensified their insolent demand, instead of acting with the dignity and authority becoming a Roman governor, asked them, "What shall I do, then, with Jesus, which is called Christ, whom ye call the King of the Jews?" Crucify Him! crucify Him!" was again their reply and demand. Again the irresolute and timid Pilate asks: "Why, what evil has He done? I have found no cause of

death in Him. I will, therefore, chastise Him and let Him go." And they cried out the more exceedingly, "Crucify Him?"

In these last described proceedings, it appears that the trial, as we have called it, had become purely a conflict between Pilate and the Jews; between official authority on the one hand, and the popular will on the other; between justice seeking to protect the innocent, and popular hatred and violence demanding His blood.

We have now to contemplate a new act of treachery; a second betrayal of "innocent blood," by the man who, as a Roman governor, had the power to take Jesus Christ out of the hands of his persecutors, and to give him protection. Pilate had only to act honestly, fearlessly, and with Roman determination and dignity, and in accordance with his previously publicly and repeatedly pronounced belief in the innocence of Jesus Christ, concerning all the charges brought against Him by the Jews. He knew that the Jews were bound to respect his acquittal of Jesus; and that he could enforce his decision by the military power at his command. Instead of thus acting, "when he saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man, see ye to it." The triumphant passions of the Jews, and their satisfaction at finding themselves so near to the accomplishment of their purpose, made them at once ready and emphatic in their utterance of that memorable and terrible imprecation, "His blood be on us and on our children." "And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released unto them Barabbas;" "scourging Jesus," and "delivered him to be crucified."

Of the atrocity of these acts it is difficult to think or speak but with astonishment and horror. Judas Iscariot, "for thirty pieces of silver," had betrayed Jesus to the chief priests and elders secretly. Pilate now betrayed him openly, and for the

poor purpose of keeping his seat as Roman Governor at Jerusalem. Judas led the way in the darkness of the night to Gethsemane, for "the band of men and officers" sent by the chief priests and elders to take Jesus. Pilate stood up by the light of the sun at noon-day and surrendered Jesus into the hands of his enemies. Judas "betrayed the Son of Man with a kiss." Pilate betrayed Him by the washing his hands in water while he uttered a cowardly, unblushing and atrocious disclaimer of his responsibility in the case. A few men witnessed the betrayal by Judas Iscariot. All Jerusalem now looked on upon the public betrayal perpetrated by the perfidious Pilate. And two nations, the Jewish and the Roman, in that awful hour became co-partners in "killing the Prince of Life."

It strikes our minds as a usage of astonishing barbarity in a professedly civilized nation—the Roman—that a man who was "delivered to be crucified" should, as a preparatory step, for such a terrible death, be "scourged." That this should be done, moreover, by a Roman Governor, or under his authority and dictation, was a refinement of cruelty astonishing in a nation so much boasted of as the most exalted and honored among all nations.

The continued history opens to us further and more revolting scenes in the hall of the Roman governor; and transactions in which the Roman soldiers, Pilate himself, the chief priests, and others of the Jewish officials, bore their part, with the excited populace to sustain them. The narration as compiled from the evangelists, proceeds:—"Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall and gathered unto Him the whole band, and they stripped Him, and put on Him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon His head, and a reed in His right hand; and they bowed the knee before Him and mocked Him, saying: Hail! King of the Jews!

And they spit upon Him, and took the reed and smote Him on the head; and smote Him with the palms of their hands."

Strange as it may seem, again Pilate appears. Addressing the infuriated populace, "he saith unto them, behold I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in Him. Then came Jesus forth wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the Man." Scarce an hour before he had given "sentence against Him," and "delivered Jesus to their will." Now he commends Him to their mercy as innocent. This only produced a new and more furious outburst of the popular malignity and indignation; repeating the demand—"Crucify him! crucify him." Pilate, apparently thinking it incumbent on him—however useless it might be—to keep up his resistance to their demand, and probably conscious that he had not succeeded in appeasing his own conscience, nor in ridding himself of responsibility by the act of publicly washing his hands in attestation of his innocence; and being also afraid to take Jesus out of the hands of the Jews, again yields to them and says: "Take ye Him and crucify Him; I find no fault in Him." This only afforded the Jews another opportunity to re-affirm and justify their demand, saying, "We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God." To the mind of Pilate this opened a new and unconsidered view of the possibly divine nature and character of Jesus; and he was "the more afraid," and "went again into the judgment hall and saith unto Jesus, Whence art Thou? Knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?" Jesus answered, "'Thou couldst have no power at all against Me, except it were given thee from above; therefore, he that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin." This startling disclosure showed Pilate that he was not only helping the Jews to carry out their conspiracy against Jesus, but that he was acting in high-handed and treacherous trifling with his

responsibilities to "the living God." He made a new effort to escape from the awful position in which he stood. Again he found himself helplessly and hopelessly overborne by the vehement and riotous ragings of Jewish malice against Jesus. He was also made to feel the weight of Jewish contempt for his authority and his person, and of their determination to override all his prerogatives. "If thou let this Man go," cried they, "thou art not Cæsar's friend; whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." Still more alarmed at the danger of damaging his interest with the Roman government, for the sixth time he made the effort to persuade the Jews to permit his release of their victim; "brought Jesus forth, and saith unto the Jews, 'Behold your king?'" Commentators have intimated the possibility that Pilate designed thus to try the power of irony, or that he wished to ascertain whether the sentiment of loyalty toward any sovereign had place in the Jewish mind. The Jews, however, gave him instant proof that they were too terribly in earnest to be affected by irony, or to be the subject of any experiments to ascertain their loyalty, and evinced that they were likely to consider themselves insulted by the intimation that "the Nazarene" was their king. Again, therefore, "they cried out, Away with Him! away with Him! crucify Him!" "Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your king?" "We have no king but Cæsar," answered the chief priests.

One more collision between the governor and his perverse and unmanageable subjects was occasioned by the title which was put upon the cross, for "Then said the chief priests of the Jews unto Pilate, Write not *The King of the Jews*, but that, *He said, I am King of the Jews*. Pilate answered, What I have written I have written." An act of decision at last, the only one in which he uttered or conducted himself with the dignity and authority which became him, either as a man or a Roman governor.

A volume might be written setting forth the instructions

suggested by the facts in the history of the trial of Jesus Christ, and which would deepen in every Christian heart the unspeakable mercy which moved Him in every step, from his throne to Bethlehem, and from Bethlehem to Calvary.

One object of the present article will have been answered, if it shall in any measure assist "believers in the Son of God" in studying the history of "the contradiction of sinners against Him," from the commencement of His public ministry to the night of His betrayal, and aiding their conceptions of the "mighty woes" which became concentrated upon His soul from the moment of His arrest in Gethsemane until His sufferings on the cross were "finished." Such studies of the "sufferings of Christ" will also eminently help our preparation to contemplate "the glory which should follow," and to join in that anthem of eternity "Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His blood."

ARTICLE IV.

HUMAN AND DIVINE THINGS CONFOUNDED.*

We have below an unfortunate title to a very able, but what we apprehend will prove a very useless book. In a new land like this—the author being an unknown member of the Episcopal Establishment in England—the very title will hinder its circulation, vastly. For there are multitudes who have a beetle-headed prejudice against *doctrine* which is the Scriptural word for the inspired teaching of religious truth; and as to *dogma*, which is a purely human and unscriptural word as applied to matters of belief, they cannot away with it. The words represent distinguishable things. In his own land Mr. Garbett seems to possess a respectable "Church" reputation, as the mention of himself in one of his Notes as the

* THE DOGMATIC FAITH, etc. Bampton Lectures for 1867. By Edward Garbett, M. A., of Christ Church, Surbiton, London, Rivingtons, p. 307.

Boyle Lecturer for 1863 on the "Divine Plan of Revelation," indicates. There are passages in the present work richly worthy of commendatory quotation, as the tracing the stream of Christian belief back to the fountain-head, pp. 57-62, the valuable Notes in the Appendix, 6, 9, the list of Church Confessions, p. 277, and that of authors who are witnesses to the historical faith from A. D. 97 to A. D. 1814, pp. 271-275. But much more than this would be needed to carry the nineteenth century in America with a book of such teachings, having such a title, both squarely against the grain of modern thought. The writer who could do this must be either a very trustworthy and sure, or a very eccentric and paradoxical thinker—and famous already in either case. Mr. Garbett is neither. He starts "an Inquiry into the relation subsisting between Revelation and Dogma," meaning by the latter chiefly human constructions of beliefs, between which, if there is anything more than an arbitrary relation, there is certainly none such as he affirms. And with these he everywhere confounds inspired doctrine, thus bringing this, against which there is too much prejudice, within the circle of the interest or prejudice that prevails against human dogma. The very word "Dogmatic" will repel multitudes—even many of the best Christians—from his pages. Lecky, in his *History of Rationalism*, treats Scripture doctrine as if it had the same origin with dogma, and even with superstition; an error that never can be cured by writers who fall into the opposite one, at least, apparently.

Mr. Garbett, indeed, falls into the double blunder, all the way through, of confounding two things distinct in thought and two also distinct in Scripture. In a note he cites the only passages in which "dogma" is used at all in the New Testament—five all told—but he does it with an astonishing disregard of the fact that in no one of them has it the meanings he gives it, either that of humanly stated doctrine, or even that of divinely stated doctrine. These five instances

are as follows: (1.) "Decree of Caesar Augustus," Luke 2: 1. (2.) "The decrees for to keep," Acts 16: 4. (3.) The decrees of Caesar," Acts 17: 7. (4.) "The law of commandments contained in ordinances," Eph. 2: 15. (5.) "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us," Col. 2: 14. His only comment in his note is this: "In the first three instances the sense of command is indisputably conveyed." What is this to the purpose, if no one of the things commanded is a belief? They are, instead, decrees and ordinances. One would hardly agree that the ordinances which characterized the Jewish ceremonial, and which were swept away by Christ, stood on the same foundation with Christian truths—the one addressed to reason and faith, the others matters of outward practice. Even if each is accompanied with a command, how does that show that an article of faith stated by man carries with it the authority of a divine command? And how do the decrees of Caesar, or even those of the apostles, touching *matters of practice*, authorize man to exercise authority or stretch a command over religious belief?

There is a broad gap here, which the author steps over with astonishing simplicity and unconsciousness or with astonishing lack of logical perception. Let us hear what he has to say for himself: "What God teaches must necessarily have the authority of a command. (Therefore what man teaches must also!) It was the opinion of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact that the doctrines of the Gospel are described under this term, (command or dogma), and the opinion is shared by many critics of later times. But the ideas of stability, certainty, and authority conveyed by "dogma" are confirmed the more, if in all the five places where the word occurs in the New Testament it is understood in that sense of command or decree which it undoubtedly bears in three of them."

But how, pray, if in all these cases matters of act and practice—and never of belief—are the subjects, and the only sub-

jects of divine command; if inspiration *might* have called the divine communication of truth to be believed "dogma," but never did, in a single instance—making broad and clear the distinction between dogma and doctrine; how does it appear that man's view of truth, in proposition or compend, even if accurately following the divine communications, has the authority of God's decree, ordinance, or command in itself, and is to be called, in the Scripture sense—dogma? Yet this is all the author has to offer in defense of so regarding it and so naming it throughout his book! From such a writer and thinker what could be expected but iterated and re-iterated and re-re-iterated attempts to state what dogma, so conceived, *is*; the only success of which is to show a more and more hopeless floundering, and sinking in quagmires of thought? He seems at last utterly incapable of distinguishing between truth, or the direct apprehension by the mind of reality, and its statement in words, (or what is supposed to be a statement of it), and actually ascribes to the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England the authority of Holy Scripture! with a refreshingly unconscious tyrannical spirit that might satisfy some American bishops. This is the more surprising, because he can sometimes—at least in secular things—work out a clear and sharp distinction, as between law and power in nature, p. 72, and it must be the effect of his "churchly" or sectarian education. And it is the more mournful because he often states strongly and admirably the necessity of doctrine without the mind and belief of doctrine within it to all the phases of real spiritual life.

Sometimes the inextirpable confusion of the writer's mind in respect to several terms standing for several things appears in the use of them all in a single sentence: *e. g.* "The gradual corruption of her *doctrine*, (that of the church) consisted not so much in denying the *truth* with which she had been put in trust, as in adding to it *dogmas* of her own." Any clear thinker would use these three italicised words for three things, as

Mr. Garbett seems to do here, but as he does not habitually. He speaks of "dogmas of man's making" and "dogmas of God's revealing" in the same breath. He contends vehemently for man's right to be dogmatic, after importing into the word as applied to the teachings of truth, what Scripture confines to the requirement of action; and confounds authority with reason by saying—"at every step a dogmatic faith appeals to reason." The Church of Rome, he declares, "is trebly dogmatic, dogmatic by virtue of the truth inherited from the days of the Apostles, by virtue of the doctrines (?) she has herself added under the plea of development to the Apostolic and primitive teaching, and by virtue of the absolute jurisdiction she claims over faith and conscience." As these three are all placed on an equality we do not see why, "by virtue" of them, and of the admirably Romanesque confusion of mind he must be in, the man who can so write does not fall into the Church of Rome. He is dogmatic enough for her certainly.

One is half-disposed to excuse all this palpable blundering in view of the vagueness of dictionaries and books of synonyms on these two words—doctrine and dogma. But then Scripture is not vague. Even Smith's "Synonymes Discriminated," the latest of these books, confounds doctrine and theory with each other. A more legitimate excuse for a churchman is the fact, as Garbett himself states it, that the Church of England "declares what is contained in Holy Scripture, and what is gathered from it and proved by it, to be of equal authority,"—allowing nothing for human fallibility in the process of gathering. But then one is under greater obligation we imagine to be an intelligent Christian than even to be a good churchman! "I employ the word *dogma*," he says on one page, "for a revealed truth and for ecclesiastical formulas, so far, and so far only, as they express the mind of God in His word." "For "dogma" is only another word for a positive truth, positively asserted." Who shall decide whether a dogma, so called, does express the mind of God in His word? Shall we take the judgment of

one who goes in the face of God's Word in the use of the very term dogma? But on a later page he admits that "in the full sense of the word there can be no dogma beyond the circle of divine revelation,"—an admission he constantly disregards. If the admission is correct, however, then there can be no authority of dogma beyond the circle of revelation, whether the term is used in its legitimate sense of the practical requirement or in the unwarranted unscriptural one of doctrine." It has pleased God," he sophistically argues, "to deliver the faith once for all to the saints, and the formulating of this faith into definite articles has necessarily been accomplished by their hands." There is a palpable substitution, in the last clause, of the "saints" who drew up the XXXIX Articles and others of later times, for those of the Apostolic age who were the channel of Scripture. Is it necessary to say that the faith was in no sense whatever delivered to the same "hands" that formulated the definite articles? Is it necessary to say that any man who can so write must have been made a Boyle lecturer in 1863 and a Bampton lecturer in 1867—to put it softly—by sheer mistake? But let us go on. "Whatever authority, therefore, is due to the Scriptures, is due to the doctrines generalized from them, in the same way that the accuracy of a scientific conclusion depends upon the accuracy of the data from which it is drawn." Neglecting the rhetorical and logical reversal of the order of thought in this curious sentence, let it be noticed how the relations of observation and reason in the one case—data and conclusion—are asserted to be just like those of inspiration and reason in the other. Notice, too, the confounding of accuracy and authority. Generalization, (by which he seems to mean inductive inference!) carries with it the accuracy of immediate observation or perception, and in the same way the generalizing of dogmatic formulæ carries with it the authority of Scripture! Can absurdity farther go? All this, however, is by no means strange in one who can declare that there are no truths "acquired by the intuitions," and can define philoso-

phy as "the knowledge of the moral," while science is "the knowledge of the physical causes of things." But this is not all the absurdity of this most absurd Bampton lecturer. He even adds: The Scriptures and the doctrines (dogmas, like the XXXIX articles are meant) have an equivalent authority. If the truth of Scripture be called into question, then the truth of the doctrines (formulae, or articles) may consistently." Which holds good if, and only if, the formulae are generalized by the same authority that dictated Scripture. Still more explicitly the monstrous churchism of the man is set forth thus: "The dogmatic doctrines as formulated by the church are no more than the Scriptural truths in a technical statement. They therefore rest on the same authority—that is, *on the authority of God*. Hence they are clear, definite, positive, and unchangeable as *their Author*."

We were going to say that the imperative quality of a Divine command—the only authorized sense of "dogma"—can be imparted to a human statement, article, or formula, only by the same Divine authority; that if a doctrine is received for its perceived truth, i. e., its correlation to reality in things, it is just *not* accepted on authority; that the authority which God gives to a doctrine, is manifestly not of the same sort in itself, nor addressed to the same thing in us, as that which He gives to a decree, command, or dogma, and can be imparted even to the divinely revealed doctrine only by God himself; that the evidences of authority appeal to reason, but authority itself, once evidenced and accepted, is above reason; that wherever the work of uninspired human reason appears in the construction of an objective "faith"—be its pretensions to be "dogmatic" ever so high—its standard is reason itself, for it must be, and reason cannot rise above reason; that the reasonbleness and truth of divinely authenticated doctrines are to be presumed while not yet perceived, but even when they come to be perceived, the doctrines still rest on the Divine authority from which they came—other-

wise that authority is displaced and dethroned ; that to ascribe the same authority to the human copy, digest, or statement of doctrine, is also to displace and dethrone the Divine authority ; and that it does not mend the matter to argue that the same truth is contained in the original and the copy, *and therefore the same authority*, for this is to substitute the perceived reasonableness of truth for the authority of God in the first instance, and for authority as such throughout, dethroning God as well, and ascribing a false origin to doctrines beyond reason and not first received as her dicta. But what can be said to a man who holds that the Articles of his Church, or sect, have, as was said of truth—its very self—"God for their Author?"

RECOMPENSE.

Blessed He whose gracious will
Left this living chronicle—
Though the heavens flee away,
Truth shall never know decay ;
Smite the temple of the soul—
Three days shall rebuild the whole.

From the downward flowing rills
Mists, rebounding, climb the hills ;
From the ever wasting flower
Fragrance riseth hour by hour ;
From the life that now we see
Grows the purer life to be.

Sorrows bend us to the dust,
Grief doth bow, and ever must ;
But distilled from falling tears
Upward-winging hope appears,
And alone to downcast eyes
Comes the light of paradise.

If a lion stop the way,
Wrestling with him valiantly,
We shall learn, in earnest fight,
Faith is heavier-armed than might ;
And when patience conquers wrong
Out of sorrow springeth song.

So when days of peace shall be,
And we turn aside to see
Vestige of our conquered foe,
Sweetness from the scene shall flow ;
And to make the joy complete,
From the Eater cometh meat.

THE BOOK TABLE.

THE HOLY BIBLE according to the Authorized Version, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a revision of the translation. By Bishops and other clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A. Canon of Exeter, Vol. I. *The Pentateuch*. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Pp. 928. 8vo.

This is the first volume of the "Speaker's Commentary." It is one of the few books which the student will wish larger; although, perhaps, for the general circulation in view its present bulk is sufficient. Perhaps the best description of it is to say that it is an excellent outline and basis for the study of the Pentateuch. The explanations, though brief, are usually to the point, and while exhibiting full acquaintance with the latest scholarship, they are free from pedantry. They are written from an evangelical and conservative position. A student will often desire fuller discussion and evidence; but the results given will usually furnish him a good point of departure for further investigation. The collateral discussions are extremely valuable—perhaps the most valuable feature of the book. They comprise a great amount of information in a very compact form, and place the reader in more complete and convenient possession of the diversified topics which stand associated with the study of the Pentateuch, than any one volume we know. No student and no intelligent Christian will make a mistake in buying it. We could offer criticisms; but to do it satisfactorily would require more space than we can now devote to it.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By Charles Hodge, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. Vol. I. Chas. Scribner & Co., New York. S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago. Pp. 648. 8vo.

Dr. Hodge here gives the matured results of his life's thinking. The entire treatise of which this is the first installment will command wide attention for two reasons: first, because it is the long elaborated work of a clear, strong thinker: second, because it is so comprehensive and exhaustive in its aim. There is nothing in the English language which approaches it in this latter respect. The author has endeavored to pass in review the whole field of theology, and to meet all its questions down to the present time. No man will hesitate to concede to it singular ability, and remarkable condensation. Nor will any man, whether on particular points he

assent or dissent, fail to derive great intellectual quickening and expansion from its careful study. For its broad survey, its sharp analysis, its clear statement of the questions at issue, and its wide inclusion, it will take its place in the theological libraries of the men of all schools. As any attempts to enter upon the details of such a work in a notice like this would be an impertinence, we forbear. Three things, however, occur to us as our eye runs over some of the points made: (1) the cropping out of a somewhat dogmatic assertion of doubtful points, thus, (p. 484), "The language employed in the creation of man, 'let us make man in our own image,' admits of no satisfactory explanation other than that furnished by the doctrine of the Trinity;" (2) the lack of flexibility, after all, to meet the exact phases of modern difficulties as on the doctrine of Inspiration; (3) the occasional failure in minutely accurate knowledge in parts of his wide range, as when he asserts (p. 505) the mechanical rule that the absence of the article with *Theos* is proof of its being a predicate, and when (p. 518) he implies that the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus on 1 Tim. III, 16, is still doubtful. But such lapses are almost inevitable.

TEXTUAL CORRECTIONS of the Common English version of the New Testament, according to the Sinaitic and Vatican mss. with other ancient mss., and the editions of the Vulgate, the Complutensian Polyglott, Stephens, the Elzevirs, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Alford. New York: John Wiley and Son. Pp. xviii and 49, 12 mo.

This little volume covers only the gospels, and is to be continued, if called for. It is very convenient—although it limits itself mostly to the five oldest mss. and citations of the editions mentioned. It gives only the variations that can readily be expressed in English. The Introductory Essays on Biblical Criticism by Tregelles and Craik are valuable. We should be glad to see the New Testament completed thus.

A LEXICON, abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon Thirteenth Edition. Boston: Ginn Brothers. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Pp. 782. Square 12 mo.

An admirably convenient and complete abridgment, retaining nearly all the valuable features of the original, except the general citation of passages, discussions upon derivations, and late or technical words. For ordinary, rapid use it is very desirable.

A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN GREEK, according to the text of Tischendorf; with a collation of the Textus Receptus, and of the texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. By F. W. Gardner, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Andover, W. F. Draper; Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 268, 8vo.

The title of this volume indicates its character in general. Besides what is there stated, we add that it cites, in full, quotations from the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion as well as the Hebrew, when anything

important is concerned; gives a few parallel references, a few brief notes, and a synoptical table of the various Harmonies. It is very handsomely printed, and, we presume, correctly. The notes, we think, are too many for a harmony, and of course too few for a commentary. They might wisely be reduced. Many of them have no sufficient foundation in the nature of the book. To some of them we take exception. Thus the note on p. 10, affirming that "there seems no sufficient reason for giving up the date Dec., 25th" as the birth-day of Christ, gives an entirely *inadequate* presentation of the facts in the case, and therefore should not have been appended. The assertion (p. 57,) that "almost every clause" of the Lord's prayer may be found in detached passages in the Rabbinical writings" is in very direct conflict with the result reached by Tholuck. Indeed the notes strike us as written from poverty rather than from fullness. But our most serious question concerns the adoption of Tischendorf's text. We want a new received text, but it is clear that in Tischendorf when he stands alone, we have not found it. Conceding all his eminent merits as an explorer, and even as a textual critic, his vacillations, and his caprices too, have been such as to preclude the final acceptance of his text as marking our present attainment. It has created a pretty general disappointment. We cannot think of following him, for example, in his vagary of omitting the last sentence of John iv.9, not only against all other editors, but against his own chosen authorities, the Sinaitic, Vatican, C. L., etc. The true method therefore, is that which Scrivener adopted in his Greek Testament: to place the "received text" on the page, and Tischendorf's readings with those of Tregelles and others in the margin. This course would put him where he belongs. We wait for a better text—except where Tischendorf is supported by other critics. It does not reconcile us to the present arrangement, that the means of detecting Tischendorf's deviations are furnished.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS IN ENGLISH, according to the authorized version, corrected by the best critical editions of the original. By F. W. Gardner, D. D. Andover: W. F. Draper. Chicago: W. G. Holmes, Pp. 286, 8vo.

We have serious objections to the method of this book. It adopts "the authorized version" but "corrected," and that too without giving the English reader usually *any clue to the authority on which this is done*. It does not usually intimate that there is any other alternative than the "corrected" or the common form. It follows Tischendorf even when he stands alone, *e.g.*, in the omission of "and of tables" Mark vii: 4; complicating the case by retaining in the text, bracketed, some things which Tischendorf rejects *e.g.*, John xxi: 25. The note in the latter passage that "Tischendorf omits this verse," would lead the reader to suppose that in the former other critics joined him. He also retains, bracketed, Luke xxiv: 12, though omitted by Tischendorf and marked doubtful by Lachmann and Tregelles. In the

same way he retains Mark xvi, 8:20. In other words, it is really Dr. Gardner's text. Again, while purporting to correct the translation in "a few instances," he leaves other equally clear instances untouched: thus Luke xi: 41 "give alms of *such things as ye have*," and Luke vi: 38 "shall *men* give." And while adopting the changed reading of Luke ii: 14, he translates "peace to men of good will." It does not seem to us that the method of this book was at all well considered.

DIATESSERON; the life of our Lord in the words of the gospels. By F. W. Gardner, D. D. Andover: W. F. Draper. Chicago: W. T. Holmes.

Another work by the same author. It is his English harmony woven into a continuous narrative.

MEDITATION, THE FUNCTION OF THOUGHT. Andover: W. F. Draper. Chicago: W. G. Holmes, Pp. 212, 12mo.

A fragment of a large work in contemplation. Written by a highly thoughtful man of wide reading and culture.

CYCLOPEDIA OF BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE. By John McClintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vols. I-III, A to Gr. pp. 947, 933, 1048. New York: Harpers.

Each volume of this comprehensive work closes with a list of articles, more than five hundred in each. The lists at the close of volumes II and III give the initials of the authors of articles also. The authorship in volume I. is indicated only in the Preface. Rev. W. W. Andrews, Dr. Quint, Prof. Park, and Pres. Woolsey are the only Congregational writers we notice; and Prof. Hitchcock, Dr. Hodge, Dr. Schaff, and Dr. Taylor the only Presbyterians. The biographical sketches of Congregational ministers in Vol. I. were by Mr. A. Merwin. Most of the articles throughout are from Methodist hands. The article on Congregationalism in Vol. II. is, however, by Dr. Quint, 16 columns, (author's initials incorrect.) That on the Christian Law of Divorce, 7 columns, we suppose is by Pres. Woolsey, ("T. W."—initials also incorrect.) Also that on Pres. Dwight—brief. That on Cocceius, 4 columns, is by Mr. Andrews. In volume III., that on Jonathan Edwards, 7 columns, on his son, 4 columns, on Dr. Emmons, 2 columns, and on Bela B. Edwards' brief—are by Prof. Park. The first of these, besides being interesting in itself, is noticeable in contrast with those of George Bancroft on the same subject in the New American Cyclopaedia. Volume IV. is to contain an article on Hopkins from the same source. The preponderance of Methodist learning in these volumes should make the work only more interesting to theologians, scholars, and preachers of other denominations—not less. Out of this preponderance, and out of the fact that it is compiled for Methodist readers and students *primarily*, has grown, doubtless, the plan of including such multifarious materials. It is really three encyclopaedias in one. It

is biographical, historical, and doctrinal, as well as critical and Biblical. And it is very able in each department, sufficiently so to render it a valuable addition to libraries of institutions and of scholars which are already furnished with special cyclopaedias. To private Christians who have not these helps to an intelligent piety, it will prove still more valuable.

In general the articles are briefer than those of Alexander's *Kitto*, or *Smith*—as would naturally result from their multitude and variety. "It is the aim of the present work, as a Dictionary of the Bible, to combine the excellencies of both the great works named, and to avoid their faults." "We have intended," say the Editors, "to reproduce all that is valuable in these works." Winer's *Biblisches Real-worterbuech* has also been largely used. But "more than half the articles on Biblical topics are entirely original." Dr. Strong has done this part of the work, and exceedingly well. The great diversity of topics demanding both longer and shorter treatment has tested his capacity, learning, and laboriousness. Biblical introduction and philology, as well as Bible names, are included in this department. The lamented Dr. McClintock's work on Theology—Systematic, Historical, and Practical, could but be admirably wrought out. Among their most industrious and skillful assistants we notice Profs. A. J. Schem and G. F. Comfort, neither of whom would do inferior work; Profs. J. F. Hurst, B. H. Nadal, M. L. Stoeber, G. F. Holmes, and J. W. Marshall, besides others less known. Of these, the most serviceable is J. N. Boeschel, of Paris. Prof. Hitchcock has a very good account of Clement of Rome, Vol. II., and Prof. Schaff, one of the Clementines. Mr. Oliver Johnson describes the Progressive Friends. Dr. Harbaugh, of Mercersburg, writes on Cyprian and the Donatists. Dr. Hodge expounds the Election of Grace from his standpoint, and Dr. McClintock follows with the Methodist view. Both write with marked ability, and this catholic style of handling disputed points is admirable. We shall look for the succeeding volumes of this superior compend with very great interest and hope.

MEMOIR of the Life and Character of Rev. Lewis W. Greene, D. D., with a selection from his sermons. By Le Roy J. Halsey, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the North-West. Pp., 492, 12mo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. Chicago: Wm. G. Holmes.

In these days of excessive story-telling, a book presenting a real character, consecrated, is refreshing. Dr. Greene was a Southern man, and his leading characteristics were of the best Southern type. With good talents, he was highly emotional and imaginative. These traits, in connection with a commanding person, a retentive memory and ready use of language, rendered him an effective platform speaker and pulpit orator. At times, his oratory evidently rose to what has been termed, "logic set on fire," and, if, from his mental structure, there were other times, when all that burned was not logic, his constitutional ardor did not cease to be interesting; and he seems

to have been a favorite in the fields where he labored. His memoir is much the briefer portion of the volume, in which the narrative of an ardent life is neatly given, as dictated by the affection of a personal friend.

The Sermons, twenty-nine in number, are, in language, chaste; in style, flowing; in illustration, rather diffuse; so that, at times, leaves seem more abundant than fruit. They evidently belong to that class of Sermons, which are better appreciated, as heard from the pulpit, than when read. The personal friends of Dr. Greene who may be able, from memory, to restore the manner of the preacher, will appreciate them most highly.

GOOD SELECTIONS, in Prose and Poetry, for the use of Schools, Academies, etc. By W. M. Jelliffe, Teacher of Elocution. Pp., 166, 16 mo., paper cover. Price fifty cents. J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.: 14 Bond St. New York.

The title of this little book tells the truth: "Good Selections;" in most instances, very good.

HADYN'S UN-VERBAL INDEX OF BIOGRAPHY. All Ages and Nations, from Anno Mundi 1. to Anno Domini, 1869. Edited by J. Bertrand Payne. New York, Virade and Yorston, pp. 586.

One would not expect to find American biography adequately represented here, and it would be richly worth the time of some one who has access to the data, or can secure it in the course of some years, to undertake an American continuation. Nor is all set down under living names, or names of those recently deceased, that we should look for. But it is a work of great merit and use nevertheless, "no unworthy confrere of the Dictionary of Dates," so well known. Excellent and quite indispensable *adjutores memorie*, both. This book has some eighty pages more than it seems to have, about that number being occupied with lives of Monarchs, unpagged, (why?)—a sketch of the history of each nationality accompanying. The printing is so accurate, notwithstanding the large multitude of items, that *but one erratum* is added, at the bottom of the last page. Think of that all American printers.

ESSAYS, LITERARY, MORAL AND POLITICAL, by David Hume, Esq. London: Alex. Murray & Son. pp. 557.

One of Murray's admirable "Reprints," a series including Hallam, Bolingbroke, Warton, Gibbon, Pepys, Morrell, Scott, Leon Herbert, Miss Aikin, DeSolme, Evelyn, McCulloch, Montaign, Locke, Adam Smith, etc., etc. The Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding, the Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals, and the Dissertation on the Passions are here, besides the XXXVIII Essays proper. The whole is a "careful reprint of the 2 vols. 8vo. edition," and contains what the author desired "may alone be regarded as containing his philosophical sentiments and principles." As his history is elbowed more and more out of sight by Macaulay and Froude,

this compact volume will keep before scholars most of what they may care to retain of Hume.

SMITHSONIAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE, Vol. XVII. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family.* By Lewis H. Morgan, Rochester, N. Y., Washington, D. C., Smithsonian Inst. pp. 590.

The investigations comprised in this elaborate work extend over more than four-fifths of the human family. They resolve themselves into forms of relationship, the descriptive and the classificatory, each ascending to remote antiquity. The first comprises the Aryan, Semitic and Uralian races, the latter being the author's name for the Turk and Finn stocks, which have an independent system of relationships. The second includes the Ganowanian, Eskimo, Turanian, Malayan and unclassified Asiatic families. Mr. Morgan draws the inference from his laborious and voluminous investigations that intermarriage in the same family was the primitive barbarian custom, disclosing, he says, "the hole of the pit whence we have been digged." The elaborate tables in his work give him occasion to say that most of the materials were furnished by American missionaries, of whom he says: "There is no class of men upon earth, whether considered as scholars, as philanthropists, or as gentlemen, who have earned for themselves a more distinguished reputation. Their labors, their self-denial and their endurance in the work to which they have devoted their time and their great abilities, are worthy of admiration. Their contributions to history, to ethnology, to philology, to geography, and to religious literature, form a lasting monument to their fame. The renown which encircles their names falls as a wealth of honor upon the name of their country.

FAMILIES OF SPEECH: *Four Lectures before the Royal Institution of Great Britain.* By Rev. Frederic W. Farrar, M. A. F. R. S. London, Longmans, pp. 192.

These able and deeply interesting lectures were delivered before the same Institution as the nine which compose Max Muller's "Science of Language," but nine years later. They cover less ground; they deal less with details of Comparative Philology, more with grand generalizations and questions of history; and they are more eloquent. The linguistic trees scattered through the text, and the philological tables and maps appended are ingenious and useful. The first lecture traces the growth of Comparative Philology,—an interesting narrative. Two lectures are then occupied with the Aryan and Semitic families of race and speech, respectively. The last shows that there is no third or "Turanian" family, and under the name "Allophyllian" discusses and characterizes the immense variety of low-type languages that remain, "perhaps a thousand," which are not Aryan, and not Semitic, and which have not yet "been grouped together by mutual affinities," monosyllabic, agglutinating, and polysynthetic. The author

prefers Steinthal's classification as recognizing psychological distinctions as well as grammatical structure. He is best known this side the water as editor of "Essays on a Liberal Education," and author of "Seekers after God." A dozen other volumes have proceeded from his pen. So practiced a writer should be above his manifest fondness for the word "infructuous"—for "unfruitful."

HAND-BOOK OF ENGLISH LITERATURE, for the use of High Schools, etc., By Francis Underwood, A. M., Boston: Lee & Shepard. pp. 608.

The only fault we find with this peerless selection is its price. Not its size. It could not well be smaller and be of any considerable value as a representation of "British Authors." It is an exhibit of all deceased authors who have a permanent place in English Literature, and a judicious, just, and sufficient one; of the living it represents Carlyle, Miss Martineau and her brother, Kinglake, Lord Lytton, Disraeli, Tennyson, Froude, Kingsley, Clough, Ruskin, Tyndall, "Geo. Elliot," Thompson, Hughes, Mrs. Craik, Lecky, Jean Ingelow, Morris and Buchanan. If another book of American authors of equal cost is to be added to the list of High School books, can this study be generally pursued? As to the merit of Mr. Underwood's selection there can be no question among persons of large reading and cultivated taste. It is simply unapproached by any other. And his "Historical Introduction" is one of great judgment, skill and worth.

THE NATION: The Foundations of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States. By E. Mulford. New York: Hurd and Houghton, pp. 418.

Philosophical statesmen and philosophical writers on topics of statesmanship, have been so few in this land, that the approbation and applause with which Mr. Mulford's able and exceptional work has been received, and the attention it has won, are not surprising. These twenty solid chapters furnish such a discussion of the characteristic elements and relations of a republican state, as we have nowhere in English beside. The progress of thought is logical, the views propounded and reasoned out are profound and Christian. The very titles are appetizing to thinkers. The contents of the first chapter disclose well enough the genius and scope of the book—"The Substance of the Nation" defined as founded in the nature of man, as a relationship, a continuity, an organism, a conscious organism, a moral organism, and a moral personality.

THE STORY OF MY LIFE. By Hans Christian Andersen. Now first translated. Author's Edition. New York: Hurd and Houghton, pp. 569.

It reads just like Herodotus—was the report of one who had preceded us in perusing this singular autobiography,—just such quaint simplicity, and naïve, unconscious egotism. Weird and wild too, in incident and costume

at times, and altogether strange throughout to American experience and thought. We read for ourselves and found the report of the home critic accurate and just. To one that has little that is more tasking at hand, the innocent garrulousness of Andersen may be, we can conceive quite charming; to one whose reading must needs lie in more laborious fields, it is a trifle wearisome. It has all his graces, however, of diction and expression.

AD FIDEM, or Parish Evidences of the Bible. By Rev. E. F. Burr, DD., author of *Ecce Coelum* and *Pater Mundi*. Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co. 1871, pp. 353.

In this new work of Dr. Burr, the evidences of Christian truth are presented with the same vigor of style, and earnestness of conviction, shown in his former writings. Searching tests are applied to those asserting a wish to know the truth, and it is maintained that God will give light to all who truly desire it, use what light they have, and seek patiently for more by prayer and study. Those who are careless or unwilling to receive the truth, will be left to fall into error; and this explains the admitted conflict of religious opinions.

The arguments from the character and influence of the Bible, from prophecy and miracle, are presented in a very fresh method and with forcible illustrations from history and the scenes of daily life. Great use is made of Christian experience; and it is wisely claimed that men must admit its facts as realities, and the basis of belief. The whole book rings with confidence—to use one of the author's phrases, there is not "a quaver of uncertainty" anywhere. A doubter might occasionally be repelled by what would seem to him an excess of assurance; but to most the volume will be a most useful tonic, showing the power of an earnest faith—and the abundant warrant we have for firm convictions and the bold assertion of them. The title of the book alone repels us.

GUTTENBERG, AND THE ART OF PRINTING. By Emily C. Pearson. Boston: Noyes, Holmes & Co., 1871, pp. 292.

The new and enterprising firm, which published *Ad Fidem*, have brought out this volume in a most tasteful style.

The facts in the life of Gutenberg have been diligently collected, and with some aid of imagination, wrought into a very interesting tale. Interwoven with this are many instructive and curious facts relating to the early history of printing, and the processes now in use. The whole abounds with well executed illustrations.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF HENRY LORD BROUGHAM, written by himself. Vol. II. Harper & Bro., New York, S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago. 12mo. pp. 392.

This second volume is of far more interest and value than the first. It covers the first stage of the Statesman's public life from 1808 to 1829, a

period of exciting events in English and European history. Lord Brougham's account of his personal connection with the rescinding of the Orders in Council, the trial of Queen Caroline and the Bill for Catholic Emancipation, takes the reader behind the scenes, and gives a vivid distinctness to his impressions of both the persons and the doings concerned with those transactions.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST, by Rev. William Hanna, D. D. The American Tract Society, N. Y. 8vo. pp, 861.

We are glad to see this valuable work, which has already been noticed in our columns, put forth by the Tract Society in a form and at a price calculated to give it a wide circulation.

AT LAST; *A Christmas in the West Indies*. By Charles Kingsley, with illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 12 mo. pp., 465.

This is a book of easy, pleasant and instructive reading. It embraces facts of personal adventure, and personal observation, interspersed with comments, scientific and moral, all done up in the graceful style which characterizes the writings of the distinguished author. One who supposes himself well acquainted with the West Indies, will find here much new and valuable information.

REPUBLICS; or *Popular Governments an Appointment of God*. By the Rev. John Crowell, D. D., Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 18mo. pp., 238.

The author attempts to show, in opposition to the doctrine of the divine right of Kings, that Republican governments are a gift from God. For this purpose, he considers severally the Republic of the Hebrew state—the Republics of the Christian Church, and the Republics in Church and State resulting from the diffusion of Christianity in modern times. The book presents a good resumé of facts and principles in the line of its subject, though some points seem to us overstrained.

[NOTE.—We regret that quite a number of books, sent by publishers, for notices in this number, were burned and we have no record of them. We had also designed for this number a careful notice of our most important exchanges, which we now find to be impracticable. Our friends, the publishers, must this time, "take the will for the deed."]

THE ROUND TABLE.

FIRE LIGHT.—God sometimes speaks so that man must hear. He has lessons of a thousand years; and when he chooses, he writes them in letters that outshine the blazings of the fieriest rhetoric. As the man who should have predicted all the history of the great Southern Rebellion would have been counted a madman, so he who should have foretold all the facts of the Chicago fire one week before, would have been called a fool. But it all came to pass, and the wisdom of the wise came to naught.

God showed to us, written in letters of flame by night upon the sky, the resistlessness of his might. In twenty-four hours he laid low the achievements of a generation. He drove his scourge four miles in a right line through the heart of a great city, brushing away its brain-work and hand-work as one sweeps down a cob-web. Twice it leaped the river on its way; and once it crossed the bridge, when the bridge was swung. When the firemen made a stand it hurled the fire-brands far over their heads. The flames even burned their engines and licked up their water works. Men saw their costly buildings, their elegant fabrics and their cherished homes vanish before their eyes. They fled, to be again put to flight; and the clearest head could not tell where there was a place of safety. They rescued their goods to have them burned at last. They saw their precious papers burned in the ashes, with no certainty of ever beholding them again. They watched the sky longingly for a rain, and watched the wind in terror lest it should change. The river lay on one side and all lake Michigan slept on the other; while 300,000 people helplessly beheld the flames burn on till they burnt out.

God showed us with how slight an agency he could humble the pride and power of man. A lamp, a cow and a barn were his simple apparatus. A flame that a breath would put out, a breeze that moved the vessels briskly on the lake, and the very negation of water, a drought, did his fearful work. God gave a wisp of burning straw the victory over all the forces of a great city.

God showed us the breadth and the minuteness of his workings. If there are any events on earth of which it were fitting that he should take charge, one of them would seem to be that in which the lives, the homes,

and the life-earnings of a quarter of a million of human beings were concerned; their wealth, their treasures of art, their benefactions, and all their earthly hopes. But if God watched the conflagration, he watched the kerosene lamp; if he cared for the court house, the custom house, and the chamber of commerce, he took note of the hovel. If it was God who had measured out those hundred human lives to their "appointed time," then God was in the wind and in the dry air; and every drop of rain that did not fall, was locked up by God.

God showed us the vanity of human expectations. Accumulated fortunes shrivelled up in a night and a day. The poor and the rich were made houseless together. Life plans and prospects by the thousand were forcibly arrested and reversed. Many a man as he looked upon the waving of smoke and flames above his costly piles, realized for once that riches "take wings." Not a man in the city but had some of his schemes violently broken in upon that day; not a man but despondingly watched the elements to see whether the end were yet come.

God showed us the fallaciousness of the best securities. From first to last it was one continuous baffling of all human foresight and worldly wisdom. The strong-hold of the government funds, and the isolated building of the county records proved alike faithless. "Fire-proof" buildings meant little or nothing. The very property which all the shrewdest lenders selected for their choicest securities was wiped out. Favorite insurance companies could pay nothing. When the vaults surrendered their papers safe, it was still an anxious question what those papers would be worth. The banker who saved half a million or more, trusted to a negro and an old trunk, while he himself was driven half suffocated before the flames. While the fire was raging, God gave the authorities all they could do to take care of their families and themselves. In the height of the danger, the only hope—the water supply—suddenly was lost.

God showed us the meanness to which human nature can sink. We have no heart to speak of the extortioners, the thieves, the incendiaries, the drunkards, the cursing and accursed wretches who stalked around in this hour of darkness. God delivered us, and may God deliver all!

God showed us the difference which Christianity has wrought. When Rome burned, or famine or pestilence desolated the cities and regions of the ancient empires, where were the messengers of relief? But now not alone every village of the nation, but the cities of the old world, throbbled with sympathy and teemed with help.

God showed us our real blessings. How many a family then felt that the life was more than the meat, and the body than its raiment. How many an anxious husband or parent then felt that the life of wife or child was more than millions on millions of money. Some noble men who have, as men say, lost all, have already found that character is capital, and rejoiced

that past beneficence can not be destroyed. If no other reason, can we not see a sufficient reason for this great and awful providence in its startling a city, a nation and the world, into a clear perception of *what things can be burned, and what things cannot.*

God also showed us how he can and yet will surprise mankind in the day when the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Here was a man caught at unawares in his own house. There were men on the house-tops who never came down. There were men and women destroyed in their places of refuge and of safety. Drunken men were roasted in the streets. A great multitude were taken completely by surprise. So shall it be when He cometh to judge the world.

SCIENCE RIGHT SIDE UP.—Some one has said lately that it is the disgrace of science that no theory of life is yet held, or has been even proposed, among scientific men, that will stand even a moment's investigation. The latest theory, which the unreligious scientific thinkers are striving to make acceptable, is simply no theory at all, but a denial that there is any such thing as life. The late President of the British Association plants himself squarely with religious men and all other discriminating persons, affirms life, and denies the ancient notion, revived by Huxley, Spencer, and the rest, that "under meteorological conditions very different from the present, dead matter may have run together, or crystallized, or fermented, into 'germs of life,' or 'organic cells,' or 'protoplasm.'" Science brings a vast mass of inductive evidence against this hypothesis of spontaneous generation. Careful enough scrutiny has, in every case up to the present day, discovered life as antecedent to life. "Dead matter cannot become living," says Sir William, "without coming under the influence of matter previously alive. This seems to us as sure a teaching of science as the law of gravitation." *Exit*, Spontaneous Generation! Will the anti-theists take notice that science bows this darling of theirs—and bugbear of many good people—out of doors?

Sir William proposed as *his* theory of the origin of life on the earth, that the first germs were borne hither by aerolites. He deems this supposition not unscientific, and the objections to it easily answerable. "From the earth stocked with such vegetation as it could receive meteorically, to the earth teeming with all the endless variety of plants and animals that now inhabit it, the step is prodigious; yet according to the doctrine of continuity all creatures now living on earth have proceeded by orderly evolution from some such origin." He then quotes two passages from Darwin on evolution, adding: "I have omitted the sentence describing briefly the hypothesis of 'the origin of species by natural selection,' because I have always felt that this hypothesis does not contain the true theory of evolution, if evolution there has been, in biology. Sir John Herschell, in ex-

pressing a favorable judgment on the hypothesis of zoological evolution, with, however, some reservation in respect to the origin of man, objected to the doctrine of natural selection that it was too like the Laputan method of making books, and that it did not sufficiently take into account a continually guiding and controlling intelligence. This, seems to me a most valuable and instructive criticism. I feel profoundly convinced that the argument of design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent zoological speculations. Reaction against the frivolities of theology, such as are to be found, not rarely, in the notes of the learned commentators on Paley's "Natural Theology," has, I believe, had a temporary effect in turning attention from the solid and irrefragable argument so well put forward in that excellent old book. But overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie all around us, and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing to us through nature the influence of free will, and teaching us that all living beings depend on one everlasting Creator and Ruler." Welcome and timely news, with the true ring in them, from the chair of the British Association!

Touching Sir William's theory of the possible and probable origin of earthly life, an English religious journal remarks: "The idea that life-germs may traverse space in connection with aerolites was thrown out at least as early as the commencement of this year by Peter Bayne, who credits it to Hugh Miller. The aid furnished by spectrum analysis in tracing the extent of unity in nature, is cited by Mr. Miller, and he suggests that the correspondences between terrestrial magnetism, and spots of the sun, and the systems of aerolities which have recently attracted so much attention furnish a new and wonderful example of it. Mr. Miller presses Tyndall's teachings about the "infinitesimal smallness of germs of life" into his service, adding very shrewdly, the question: "what proof have we that if aerolites can traverse space, life-germs cannot traverse space likewise?"

To say the least of it, this theory has less against it than that of the evolution of life from dead matter, that is, of something from nothing by the inherent power of the nothings! and it leaves the question of the origin of life, in either aerolites or space, untouched. It simply locates the theological or Biblical explanation somewhat further back. It is worth noticing, that in the present state of the question in really scientific circles no logical thinker has the least excuse for choosing an atheistic explanation. Let us put a pin in *there*. We have had beside us, while writing, Appleton's "Educational Record," with its unprepossessing wood-cut portrait of Huxley, and the half-confident, half-sinister expression of the features has seemed to assume an extra leer on the subject. The "Lord of Life and Glory," who "hath life in himself" is not yet deposed from His throne, nevertheless.

Dr. Lionel S. Beale, F. R. S., whose acute expose of "Protoplasm" etc., has been noticed in these columns by a scientific physician, sums up the case of life-theories in a late *contemporary Review*. He says, 'with the greatest justice, that no other theories bear so upon religious thought, and here what antagonism there now is between, not science, but certain scientific men, and religion, is most distinct, and culminates. "If it were true that the facts of science really taught that all phenomena peculiar to living beings were in reality only physical and chemical phenomena, the very ground out of which all religious thought springs would be dissipated." "If any form of the physical doctrine of life had been proved to be true, or had been shown to be based upon some sort of trustworthy evidence, or had been shown to exhibit even an appearance of plausibility, it would have undoubtedly been a duty to inquire very carefully whether religious views could any longer be considered tenable. But nothing of either sort appears. It is a mere haze of assertion by certain scientific men—not of scientific assertion, for there is no such thing—on which the *appearance* of danger to spiritual belief stands. "The most ridiculous statements about the nature of life have been approvingly sanctioned by men of high position in other branches of natural knowledge." And such writers as Spencer have thereupon generalized these fantastic fancies with an air of "encyclopediacal" learning and super-human profundity and grasp of thought!

A few of Dr. Beale's well shapen points are worth putting on record here for thinkers, both cleric and laic. "Why are we to accept the doctrine of those who assert that the laws which govern the now living matter, and the mind of man, are the same laws? *The last two have nothing in common with the first.* Where is the analogy between the inanimate stone and the simplest living thing? Does the stone, like the living particle, convert matter of different composition into substances like those of which it consists, and then divide and subdivide into little stones? Does it grow towards heaven like the tree, against the laws of gravitation?"

"According to many we seem to have been, for years past, on the eve of discovering the conditions under which the component elements of the organisms of living being could be made to combine to form the organic compounds, and these compounds made to live. It has indeed been affirmed over and over again that the morning of discovery has dawned; nay, that the living has been actually formed direct from the non-living; but the spontaneous ovum has yet to be exhibited—the living jelly has yet to be evolved from the laboratory-bred plasma."

Dr. Beale sets forth clearly the distinctions between power, force, and property—vast distinctions, and undeniable. Also, that power goes with design, form, order, &c., but force, property, &c., do not. Arrangement appears and disappears, but matter does not. And no terms employed for force or property can express power, design, order. Also, that there is no

analogy between life, which gives to matter form and structure, and flame, which destroys both. None between a living thing and a crystal; the latter can be dissolved and reconstructed, the former never can. None between man as a living creature and any analogue ever proposed. This is the last word of science on life.

PLACED IN A FALSE POSITION.—This is a great bug-bear in public assemblies. A body of Christian men have met on some definite call, and with some restricted business. When the sons of God are thus assembled, there is present also, perhaps one of those ardent personages, whose conception of liberty is the right to take possession of every public assembly for his own uses. With cat-like eagerness he watches the chance to spring. It may be with some matter of reform, which, however, has no special or general claim on that occasion. No matter. It is his Christian liberty to lord it over a whole assembly. The matter shall be discussed. To shut out his hobby and attend to business, is to fight against all righteousness. At this stage of affairs, some timid brother suggests that the subject has no business here, and ought not to have been introduced, but it is a very different thing to dismiss it now that it is introduced. "It places us in a false position."

Now it does no such thing. An organized body is at no man's beck. No one can, by his individual folly, or pertinacity, be introducing unseasonable topics, put them in any false position—except that of listening to him. It is their privilege to decide what subjects they will or will not consider, and what questions are embraced within their sphere, call, or even pleasure; although we once heard such a man inform a whole General Association, which had indefinitely postponed his favorite theme, that they *should* yet listen to it. Let us have done with this folly. Let us put down these perpetual bores. Let us not be tyrannized over in our religious convocations by any man's bull-dog tenacity. The assembly that, when it chooses, rules out any man's hobby, does not thereby put itself in a false position, but him in a true position.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.—While this subject is in our columns, [but, alas, it was burned up *in type*,] for the sake of completeness we add a remark on one point which our judicious contributor does not find room to expand. It is this, While there is a correct mode of saying exactly what we mean—or ought to mean—in our invitations to the Lord's Table, very many ministers seem to have a great aversion to saying it. They have various circumlocutions; and there is one rather a favorite with those who agree substantially with our contributor—as though a partial compromise in phraseology, and as though an attempt to exclude unworthy *professors* who are yet in regular standing. They invite "all who love our Lord Jesus

Christ in sincerity," but add, "and have made profession of their faith and love." This last clause limits the invitation to *church-members*; while some ministers deem the first clause a limitation to *worthy church-members*. But if they will consider, they will perceive that so far as the phrasology goes, it might extend to those who had made a profession and been excommunicated, but still insist, in their own minds, that they are good Christians. In other words it is a loose invitation. On the other hand, while the first clause is good preaching or exhortation, *it is nothing more*. For a Congregational minister cannot usurp the authority of the Church and refuse the communion to those whom *the Church has voted to receive*, until the Church vote otherwise. Now those members who are not under discipline, the Church has deliberately accepted. The Church used its best judgment in the matter. It may be deceived; certain persons may never have loved the Lord Jesus; they may be cold and unspiritual now. But the Church has done nothing about it, chooses to do nothing, perhaps can do nothing. There they are regularly accepted. Now, how can the minister, in his sole right, undertake to refuse those whom his Church accepts? He cannot. Then let him not make any such pretense. It is a sad thing that any man should come unworthily. Let the preacher exhort against it. But since he is neither Christ nor the Church—neither Pope nor rector—why should he pretend in his invitation to a restricting power which he does not possess. The only invitation or limitation which he has any authority to give, comes at last simply to the good old fashioned unmistakable form, "members, in good standing, of Evangelical Churches." Churches have rights which ministers are bound to respect. We cannot, for our part, see the wisdom of *industriously* setting aside statements, well-settled, precise, and well understood, for those that possess neither of these qualities. Still we do not quarrel with mere casual variations, nor make a man offender for a word.

A CLERGYMAN ON SCIENCE.—The Rev. Charles Kingsley, recently elevated to the dignity of Canon of Chester, has distinguished himself in current literature in several ways. His early novels were brilliant, his pictures of ancient society, thought, and piety were vivid,—whether always accurate or not,—his political disquisitions have been intensely earnest showing sympathy for the masses and "the pressure of the time," and his attempts to interpret mythology and natural history to juvenile readers interesting and praiseworthy. Of his published sermons we need say nothing, for the pulpit discourses of an English placeman are not counted of any special importance in the make up of his general reputation as a man of power and culture. Canon Kingsley has lately read a paper on Natural Theology, at Sion College, in which he expressed the opinion that though he "might be considered dreaming," the time would come "when every

candidate for orders would be required to pass creditably in, at any rate, one branch of physical science." The implication in this enthusiastic anticipation as to the culture and preparation of the clergy "established" in that country makes an impression upon the mind as peculiar as that of the suggestion from the *London Times* a few years since, that before taking a parish, every clergyman should be absolutely required to undergo examination in one good book of divinity, say *Pearson on the Creed*! Mr. Kingsley uses the title *Natural Theology* in the sense of religious teachings, founded not on common or former knowledge, but on the advanced scientific knowledge of nature now prevailing; but he denies that it could be the business of scientific men to show a final cause in nature, "for final causes are moral causes," (moral being used in the comprehensive sense that is opposed to physical) and their testimony that they find no trace of them is, consequently, neither here nor there. The business of scientific philosophy does not extend beyond the "How," or have anything to do with the "Why" of ontological philosophy. To those who would urge that the "doctrine of evolution does away with creation," Mr. Kingsley would reply that, "even if they accepted all that Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer had written, they might still preserve their natural theology on the principles laid down by Butler. The doctrine of evolution has its analogy in the evolution of a human body from a germ; but we do not on that account deny that God is our Creator. If there is evolution there must be an evolver. Whether Darwin's theory of evolution proves true or false, his work on the fertilization of orchids would still remain a valuable addition to natural science. Suppose that all the species of orchids should prove to be the descendents of one, and that one allied to the snow-drop, would that show less of the wonder-working power of God than if they were all created at once? The believer in God would accept this as evidence that God's works were more wonderful than he had hitherto believed them, and the superintendence which is requisite for this process of "natural selection" would make the government of the universe still more an infinite complexity of special providences. If "natural selection" was proved to be true, it would only further establish the truth of Christ's saying: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Scripture has taught us that God made all things. Shall we quarrel with science if it succeeds in establishing (rather furnishes the data of establishing) that God is so powerful that He can make all things make themselves? We must be cautious in defining that which Scripture has not defined. Scripture uses the term "created," but does not describe the process; it speaks of organizations "produced after their kind," but it does not define whether "their kind" includes the capacity of varying. Is not man produced after his kind, and how has he varied? Scientific men, while engaged in the study of bones and stones, every where find themselves met by a something nameless,

invisible, imponderable, the *forma formatica* of the schoolmen, and to which they gave the name of "vital force." When they had traced all to vibration, they were ever encountered with the question, What makes the vibration vibrate? What is curdling every cell of protoplasm? It is none other than that which Scripture calls "The breath of the living God."

Mr. Kingsley here overlooks the more recent attempts to get rid of "vital force" altogether. If life can be generated by evolution, or any other *locus pocus*, we had almost said, from that which has no life, and absolutely without the agency of anything else that has it, then what becomes of "vital force." And Mr. Kingsley's question, "what makes vibration vibrate?" does not necessarily imply a cause, since we use the same form of speech when asking for a reason, which is not a cause; *e. g.*, "what makes you think so?" But we cite and record his word as showing a phase or tendency of thought in Christian men who have earnestly cultivated science, and are not afraid of its conclusions, nor led, in the interest of religion, into any manner of foreboding. He expects science to return in due time to her becoming phase at the feet of piety. We heartily accept and emphasize his closing word to the students of Sion College: "Let those who hold to the Scriptures be patient, and wait. It is not necessary for them to cast themselves down from the pinnacle of the temple."

COLLEGE MARKS.—The following appeared not long ago in the *Congregationalist*:

"The advantages of the ranking system have been presented in this paper, in an article by President Smith of Dartmouth College. Here is a briefer presentation of the other side of the question, from an alumnus of that institution:

"That is not an apt preparation for the scenes of coming life, which dwarfs the ambition of its subject to the paltry attainment of a high mark. This system makes the merest accident of study its ultimate end, and by it many have been brought to think that, having stood high in their classes, their life work was accomplished.

"Among college students, there are those who study to master the subjects presented, and those who have no higher aim than to make a good recitation. Doubtless many of the second class have been stimulated to make great exertions. But what an insignificant purpose, and the object, if attained, how useless and unsatisfying! With a student bent on understanding a science, or investigating a subject, his mark would not have a feather's weight. We do not think the system has a good moral influence. It encourages deception, and puts a premium on 'ponying,' 'cribbing,' and 'carding.' In those working for marks it excites bitter feelings, emulation is destroyed, and at the end of four years they are supremely selfish. And what is worse, it induces hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness—prayer-meetings are attended for effect on the president and professors.

"In speaking of the evils of the system, we do not dwell on the fact that the son of Dives receives a mark ten or twenty per cent. above his deserts. Deference to wealth is universal, and the college has long since ceased to be the pure democracy it was in the days of our fathers. ALUMNUS."

How men overshoot their mark! The last two of these charges, ranking rich men's sons higher than others, and giving attendance on prayer-meetings a recognition in the class-standing, any man who has ever been a member of a College Faculty, *anywhere*, knows to be too ridiculous to deny. The "bitter feelings" and supreme selfishness; according to our observation, are the exception; the very best scholars in a class are often the best friends, and it is not uncommon in classes to accuse the best scholars of clannishness. "Ponying," "cribbing" and "carding"—if we understand their mysteries—can go but very little way. No intelligent instructor is ever imposed upon by them. The student simply imposes on himself. As to the insignificance of the aim—it is on a level with other efforts after honor, but in a peculiarly honorable sphere. It would be a pleasing thing to look upon the men "who have no higher aim than to make a good recitation;" although the ability to make such a recitation might be supposed by the simple to be no bad way "to master the subject presented." It would be equally pleasing to look upon that vast multitude, the "many [who] have been brought to think that, having stood high in their classes, their life work was accomplished." Instead of "making the merest accident of study its ultimate end," it certainly is possible to view the appointment system as applying simply an additional and *immediate* stimulus towards the attainment of that end, by the reaping now some of the same kind of fruits which will be borne in the future.

From the mode of thinking exhibited in the above extract, it was evidently written by one whose mental equipoise was never disturbed by any "high mark." It is a dispassionate statement of the great verities, probably by one who in college largely indulged in "general literature."

We simply seize the occasion to remark how absurdly any young man deports himself in college who does not give his first best energy to the studies he is there to pursue, while he has the aid of instructors whose special business is to help and guide him in them, and surrounded, as he is, by all the stimulus of other wakeful minds. After all, the "bummers" cannot altogether afford to despise "recitation scholarship;" nor, historically viewed, has the vast race of bad scholars in this world had any special reason to glory over its good ones.

OUR REVIEW.—Our readers need not be informed why the November number of the REVIEW is delayed and incomplete. The bulk of its contents was in the printers' hands, and in type. We had fortunately a single proof of each of the first three articles now presented, returned to us for final revision. Everything else, including Round Table matter and main articles, (one of them by Professor Bartlett), was burnt up, and no copy left. We present the best we can under the circumstances. We expect to make satisfactory arrangements for the future. The present number is printed at Madison, Wis.

INDEX.

Academy, The, in its Relations to the College, article by Prof. H. K. Edson, 50.
 Academies in Congress, 316.
 Adams, Prof. M. A., articles by, 233, 334.
 American Cardinal, noticed, 533.
 Amusements, 55.
 An Eventful Decade, article by Rev. J. C. Holbrook, 147.
 Anderson's History of the Sandwich Islands' Mission, noticed, 80.
 Andersen's Story of My Life, noticed, 577.

Bartholomew's Handy Atlas, noticed, 308.
 Bartlett, Prof. S. C., articles by, 63, 165, 270.
 Bascom's Lectures on Science, Philosophy and Religion, noticed, 494.
 Beecher, H. W., Sermons, noticed, 86.
 Beecher's Sermons, Fourth Series, noticed, 402.
 Beecher's Our Seven Churches, noticed, 79.
 Binnie's Psalms, noticed, 77.
 Bittinger, J. Q., article by, 136.
 Blake's Visit to American Schools and Colleges, noticed, 343.
 Blake's Bible History with General History, noticed, 362.
 Blunt's Undisputed Coincidences in the Old and New Testaments, noticed, 341.
 Blake, Rev. S. L., articles by, 34, 452.
 Boardman, Prof. G. N., article by, 513.

Carlyle, Religion according to, article by Rev. J. E. Dwinell, 413.
 Carter & Bros., Books, noticed, 89.
 Castaways, noticed, 93.
 Cassin's Astronomical and Commercial Discourses, noticed, 390.
 Chapin, President A. L., article by, 23.
 Chase's Six Books of Virgil's *Æneid*, noticed, 306.
 Chemistry, Barker's Elementary and You-man's new, noticed, 81.
 Church Music, article by Rev. J. T. Tucker, 16.
 Church and the World 314.
 Clark's Handbook of Comparative Grammar, noticed, 193.
 Clement's Handbook of Legendary and Mythological Art, noticed, 305.
 Clergyman on Science, 586.
 Cochran, Pres. S. D., article by, 253.

Darwinism, articles on, by Prof. S. Adams, 239, 338.
 Darwin's Descent of Man, noticed, 465.
 D'Aubigne's History of the Great Reformation, noticed, 190.
 Definite Preaching, article by Rev. S. L. Blake, 24.
 Diversified Ministry, 103.

Edson, Prof. H. K., article by, 50.
 Elliott & Storer's Qualitative Chemical Analysis, noticed, 540.

Farrar's Families of Speech, noticed, 576.
 Fawcett's Political Economy, noticed, 453.
 Fifteen Minutes Talk about Colleges, article, 483.
 Fire Light, 560.
 Forgotten American Author, 537.

Anderson's Treatise on Regeneration, noticed, 498.
 Anderson's Manuals of History, noticed, 308.
 Architecture and Preaching, article by Rev. J. Q. Bittinger, 136.
 Arnot's Parables of Our Lord, noticed, 403.
 Athens: The Grand Experiment, article by Rev. W. A. Nichols, 172.
 Avery, Prof. John, article by, 472.
 Austic on the use of Wines, noticed, 87.

Boise's First Lessons in Greek, noticed, 305.
 Bonar's Bible Thoughts and Themes, noticed, 77.
 Books for a Theological Student, 96.
 Books Received, 204, 310.
 Book Notices, 410.
 Boston Lectures, 1871, noticed, 497.
 Brisbane's Bible Defended, noticed, 501.
 Broadus's Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, noticed, 73.
 Brief Notes on Commentaries, article by Prof. S. C. Bartlett, 43.
 Broken Bad, The, noticed, 310.
 Brown's Pious Deed of the Medical Profession, noticed, 499.
 Burr's *Ad Fidem*, noticed, 578.
 Business and Books, 511.

Colleges, Fifteen Minutes Talk About, article, 483.
 College Marks, 588.
 Communion Invitation, 469.
 Congregationalism, English, Germs and Germination of, article by A. B. Ely, Esq., 440.
 Congregational Liturgies, 97.
 Congregational Publishing Society, Books, noticed, 408.
 Conwell's Why and How Chinese Emigrate, noticed, 88.
 Cornell's Physical Geography, noticed, 90.
 Crosby's Life and Work of Jesus, noticed, 306.
 Crowell's Republics, noticed, 579.
 Cruden's Concordance, noticed, 301.
 Curtius' History of Greece, Vol. I, noticed, 413.

Dixon's Free Russia, noticed, 304.
 Doctrinal Preaching, article by Rev. S. L. Blake, 452.
 Douai's Kindergarten, noticed, 310.
 Dudley, Rev. J. L., Article by, 159.
 Duties of Councils, 208.
 Dwinell, Rev. J. E., article by, 413.

Ely, A. B., article by, 440.
 Evangelists, Modern, etc., article by Pres. S. D. Cochran, 253.

Frank Austin's Diamonds and Eagle Crag, noticed, 309.
 Fresh Leaves in the Book and its Story, noticed, 390.
 Froude's Calvinism, noticed, 408.
 Froude's Short Studies on Great Subjects, noticed, 165.

Gardner's Dintesseron, noticed, 573.
 Gardner's English Harmony, noticed, 572.
 Gardner's Greek Harmony, noticed, 571.
 Geoffrey the Lollard, noticed, 303.
 Germs and Germination of English Congregationalism, article by A. B. Ely, 440.

Hadyn's Universal Index of Biography, noticed, 575.
 Hall's Notes on the Gospels, noticed, 496.
 Halsey's Memoir of Greene, noticed, 574.
 Hamilton's Moses the Man of God, 304.
 Hamilton, Sir Wm., Memoir of, noticed, 185.
 Hand of the Diligent, noticed, 309.
 Hanna's Life of Christ, noticed, 579.
 Harris, Miss A. B., article by, 375.
 Hebraist's Vade Mecum, noticed, 75, 333.
 Hezekiel's Life of Bismark, noticed, 580.
 Hohenzollerns, The, article by Rev. W. A. Nichols, 389.
 Hodge's Systematic Theology, noticed, 570.
 Holbrook, Rev. J. C. article by, 147.

Impossible Education, 315.

James, Substance and Shadow, noticed, 495.
 Jelliffe's Good Selections, noticed, 575.
 Jesus Christ, Trial of, article by Rev. E.

Kingsley's At Last, noticed, 579.

Lamphear, Rev. O. T., article by, 384.
 Lange's Commentary on John, noticed, 397.
 Lange's Commentary on Jeremiah and Revelation, noticed, 400.
 Land and its Story, The, noticed, 341.
 Lee & Shepard's Books, noticed, 89.
 Library of Poetry and Song, noticed, 86.
 Liddell & Scott's abridged Lexicon, noticed, 571.
 Life and Times of Lord Brougham, Vol. I, noticed 404; Vol. II, noticed, 578.

Macduff's Memories of Patmos, noticed, 199.
 Magoun, Pres. G. F., articles by, 1, 317, 562.
 March's Our Father's House, noticed, 88.
 Margaret's Old Home, noticed, 309.
 Murin on the Atonement, noticed, 498.
 Masonic Corner Stones, 412.
 McClintock & Strong's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, noticed, 573.
 McCash's Christianity and Positivism, noticed, 399.
 Meditation the Function of Thought, noticed, 573.

National Temperance Almanac, noticed, 90.
 Nature's Aristocracy, noticed, 85.
 Nebular Hypothesis, article by Dr. H. M. Lyman, 537.

Ogden's Silver Song, noticed, 504.

Paine's Questions on Romans, noticed, 200.
 Parker's Ad. Clerum, noticed, 302.
 Pastor's Manual, noticed, 407.
 Patton's Laws of Fermentation, noticed, 199.
 Paul, Before his Conversion, 101.
 Peace and Powder, 510.
 Phases of Skepticism, 505.
 Philosophical Faith, 102.

G.

Gospel in the Book of Joshua, noticed, 302.
 Greek, the Pronunciation of, article by Prof. N. P. Seymour, 215.
 Greeley's Essays on Political Economy, noticed, 303.
 Gutenberg and the Art of Printing, noticed, 578.

H.

Holmes' Light at Evening Tide, noticed, 200.
 Hopedale Tavern and Ray's Search, 90.
 Hooker, Rev. E. W., article by, 549.
 Hopkins' Law of Love and Love as Law, noticed, 201.
 Host's First Lessons in Composition, noticed, 503.
 Hudson's Greek and English Concordance, noticed, 71.
 Human and Divine Things Confounded article by Pres. G. F. Magoun, 562.
 Hume's Essays, noticed, 575.
 Hunt's Bible Notes, noticed, 76.
 Huxley's Lay Sermons, article on, by Prof. S. C. Bartlett, 270.

I.

International Law, The New Departure, article by Pres. G. F. Magoun, 317.

J.

W. Hooker, 547.
 Joanna, noticed, 309.
 Jones' Songs for the New Life, noticed, 194.

K.

L.

Lightfoot's St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, noticed, 190.
 Little Giants, 341.
 Liturgies, article by Rev. J. L. Dudley, 159.
 Lockyear's Elements of Astronomy, noticed, 499.
 Lord's Supper, Whom Shall we Invite, article by Rev. A. H. Ross, 302.
 Lord's Supper, 585.
 Lyman, Dr. H. M., article by, 537.
 Lyon, Mary: Her Faith and Works, article by Miss A. B. Harris, 375.

M.

Ministry Perishing; or not?—506.
 Ministers and People, 345.
 Mivart's Genesis of Species, noticed, 406.
 Modern Evangelists and Special Efforts to convert and save Sinners, article by Pres. S. D. Cochran, 253.
 Movement Westward, 213.
 Morris's Science and the Bible, noticed, 407.
 Mulford's Nation, noticed, 577.
 Muller's Chips from a German Workshop, noticed, 306.

N.

New Departure in International Law, article by Pres. G. F. Magoun, 317.
 Newlyn House and Go Ahead, noticed, 408.
 New Puritanism, 312.
 Nichols, Rev. W. A., articles by, 172, 389.

O.

Our Review, 589.

P.

Placed in a False Position, 585.
 Pond, Rev. E., article by, 428.
 Porphyry, article by Rev. E. Pond, 428.
 Porter's American Colleges, noticed, 71.
 Physiology, New Text Books on, noticed, 83.
 Pronunciation of Greek, by N. P. Seymour, 215.
 Pronunciation of Greek, 411.
 Pulling Off a Shoe, 210.

Questions of Modern Thought, noticed, 407.

Q.

Recompense, poetry, by J. B. L. Soule, 569.
 Recovery of Jerusalem, noticed, 301.
 Regenerate by Baptism, 214.
 Relations of Legislation to Moral Suasion in the Temperance Reform, article by Rev. O. T. Lamphear, 384.
 Religion according to Carlyle, article by Rev. J. E. Dwinell, 413.
 Reubell's Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ noticed, 198.
 Robertson, F. W., article by Pres. A. L. Chapin, 33.
 Robertson, F. W., sermons noticed, 302.
 Ross, Rev. A. H., article by, 362.
 Round Table: 61, 215, 411, 409, 505, 580; Amusements, 95; Academies in Congress, 316; Books for a Theological Student, 96; Book Notices, 410; Business and Books, 511; Congregational Liturgies, 97; Church and the World, 314; Communion invitation, 409; Clergyman on Science, 586; College Marks, 588;

R.

Diversified Ministry, 193; Duties of Councils, 288; Errata, 214; Forgotten American Author, 567; Fire Light, 589; Impossible Education, 315; Little Giants, 311; Lord's Supper, 585; Masonic Corner Stones, 412; Ministers and People, 205; Ministry Perishing or Not? 56; Movement Westward, 213; New Puritanism, 312; Our Review, 589; Paul before his Conversion, 101; Peace and Powder, 510; Phases of Skepticism, 505; Philosophical Faith, 102; Placed in a False Position, 585; Pronunciation of Greek, 411; Pulling off a shoe, 210; Regenerate by Baptism, 214; Sunday Laws, 511; Science Right Side Up, 582; Temperance Question, 411; Two Notable Utterances, 91; Unexpected Testimony, 212; University Tests, 95; Valuable Unitarian Discovery, 412; Wanted, Biblical Scholars, 206; Woman with a Sphere, 410; Woman's Rights in France, 509.

S.

Sama Veda, The, article by Prof. J. Avery, 472.
 Scanland's Heights and Depths, noticed, 503.
 Seeley's Roman Imperialism, noticed, 306.
 Seymour, Prof. N. P., article by, 215.
 Shairp's Culture and Religion, noticed, 502.
 Shedd's Sermons to the Natural man, noticed, 401.
 Smith's English-Latin Dictionary, noticed, 512.
 Smith's Saloon, noticed, 467.
 Science, Right Side Up, 582.
 Smith's Smaller Scripture Hist., noticed, 463.

Smithsonian Contributions, vol. xvii, noticed, 576.
 Smith's, Dr. Wm., Dictionary of the Bible, noticed, 297.
 Spenser's Commentary, noticed, 573.
 Spiritualism, article by Prof. S. C. Bartlett, 105.
 Stroud's Physical cause of the Death of Christ, noticed, 497.
 Sunday Laws, 511.
 Systematic Theology, Value of, to the Preacher, article by Prof. G. N. Boardman, 513.

T.

Tappan, Arthur, Life of, noticed, 82.
 Temperance Question, 411.
 Temperance Reform, Legislation and Moral Suasion, article by Rev. O. T. Lamphear, 384.
 Textual Corrections of the New Testament, noticed, 571.
 Theodore, noticed, 534.

Thompson's Theology of Christ, noticed, 198.
 Trench's English, Past and Present, noticed, 300.
 Trial of Jesus Christ, article by Rev. E. W. Hooker, 549.
 Tucker, Rev. J. T., article by, 16.
 Tuttle's Way Lost and Found, noticed, 504.
 Two Notable Utterances, 91.

U.

Underwood's Handbook of English Literature, noticed, 577.
 Unexpected Testimony, 212.
 University Series, Huxley, Barker, Ster-

ling and Cope, noticed, 85.
 University Tests, 95.
 Upham's New Mental Philosophy, article by Pres. G. F. Magoun, 1.

V.

Valuable Unitarian Discovery, 412.
 Value of Systematic Theology to the Preacher, article by Prof. G. N. Boardman, 513.
 Van Dyke's Lord's Prayer, noticed, 310.

Viardot's Apology of an Unbeliever, noticed, 81.
 Vick's Catalogue and Floral Guide, noticed, 90.
 Victory of the Vanquished, noticed, 300.
 Violet and Daisy, noticed, 339.

W.

Wanted, Biblical Scholars, 206.
 Warren's Sunday School Commentary, Gospels and Acts, noticed, 301.
 Warren's Plain Problems in Elementary Geometry, noticed, 501.
 Weidemann's Beautifying Country Homes, noticed, 87.
 Westward, noticed, 504.
 White's Report on the Geolog. Survey of Iowa, noticed, 338.

White's Words and their Uses, noticed, 75.
 Whitaker's Almanac for 1871, noticed, 307.
 Whom shall we Invite to the Lord's Supper? article by Rev. A. H. Ross, 392.
 Woman with a Sphere, 410.
 Woman's Rights in France, 509.
 Wonders of the Heavens, noticed, 408.
 Wonder Series, noticed, 89, 310.
 Wolsey's Sermons, Religion of the Present and the Future, noticed, 402.

Z.

Zell's Popular Encyclopedia, noticed, 197.

